

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1886.

I.

THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

POSITIVE ASPECT.

BY PROFESSOR E. V. GERHART, D.D.

THOUGH Holy Scripture consists of two parts, known as the Old Testament and the New Testament, differing from each other historically and religiously, yet Scripture is not illumined by two contrary lights. Two dispensations address us in the two volumes, but only one general principle. Numerous and various as are the events of sacred history, manifold and particular as are the prohibitions and the commands, seemingly contradictory as may be the divine belief, the ethics and the worship of Moses and David to the belief and worship of the Apostolic Church, and discordant as may be the hopes of Judaism and the anticipations of Christianity, yet there is but one central idea pre-supposed by all the sacred writings of the chosen people as by all the books of the Apostolic Church,—an idea living in every historic event, asserted in every law, predicted in every promise, inspiring all hopes, and moulding alike the spiritual life of the Abrahamic nation and the spiritual life

of the believers in Jesus of Nazareth. This all-comprehensive idea, distinguishing the canonical Books of the Bible from the entire range of purely human literature, is a Presence, an immanent, all-controlling Presence, that constitutes the one solar Light.

Only one idea, only one light, yet to designate this unity adequately by a single word, or even by one proposition, is difficult, if not impossible—difficult, for the reason that the central truth appears in successive epochs and stages of development, in modes so numerous and under aspects so manifold that no one term, no one formula, used by the writers, embodies the infinite riches of the truth so as wholly to embrace all its qualities and exclude whatever does not enter into its nature.

In the sacred books of the chosen nation this all-controlling principle is the Messianic idea. It is first set forth by the Seed of the woman, then by the Seed of Abraham and the Prophet like unto Moses. When David had ascended the throne the Prophet like unto Moses becomes the Son of David; and the Son of David becomes the King set upon the holy hill of Zion, the mighty God, the Prince of Peace, who shall come in the fullness of time. In the sacred books of the Apostolic Church, this principle is the Son of the Virgin, Jesus of Nazareth, the Word made flesh, the Only-Begotten of the Father, the second Adam, the Founder of the kingdom of God.

No one descriptive title, used in Scripture, expresses more than a partial conception of the vitalizing central principle. Its unfathomable wealth of import may be appreciated only by a faithful study of the ever-varying forms of imagery and direct speech in which it addresses our faith. Yet there is one Name which more fully expresses the nature and distinguishing characteristics of the immanent principle than perhaps any other; though it is by no means a complete designation. That Name is the *Christ*, the anointed One; the Messianic title of Jesus of Nazareth; He who in the protevangel comes to view as the serpent-bruise, in the Psalms and in prophecy as the Hope of Israel, and who, when Messianic history had attained to full age

is sent forth from God, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law that we might receive the adoption of sons; He, the personal Truth, is the positive light that shines in all the books of the two volumes composing Holy Scripture.

Jesus of Nazareth, the Word incarnate, is internally connected with the universal ideas, whether religious or philosophical, which historically considered, antedate Christianity; but at the same time He is from these ideas to be broadly distinguished.

Of Holy Scripture, the central principle is not the idea of a divine Being. That idea is indeed primary. It is the essential pre-supposition. That God exists is a fact antecedent and conditional to all other facts. The relation of the divine existence to the central truth of the Bible we may express negatively: no God no revelation—no God no religion. These negative propositions are valid, not merely for Christianity and for Judaism, but equally valid for every ethnic religion. God is the postulate of every cult, however much or however little of valid belief may support it. So far forth the Bible and all other sacred books stand on the same foundation. The God-idea nourishes the defective religions of Paganism. The same idea nourishes the better religion of the Hebrew people and the absolute religion founded by the Christ. Yet the light of Scripture differs from Paganism by as much as the self-manifestation of God in the incarnate Word differs from His manifestation in the disorganization of nature and in the self-perverted history of fallen mankind. If the light of Scripture were only very different in degree from the divine light shining in the books of non-Christian nations, but not different in kind, the claim of the Christ to be Himself the only light of the world would be groundless.

In Scripture the distinctive thing taught respecting Deity is not the fact universally believed, that He exists. The existence of God is the underlying presumption. No writer proceeds on the pre-supposition that any class of men need to be taught by supernatural revelation that there is a God. There are in

human nature no atheistic instincts. The presumption on which all proceed is the necessity of teaching that God is one, not many; that He is a personal One, not impersonal essence; that He is good and holy, not cruel and unjust; that He is absolute, ruling alike over the evil and the good; never that He is.

Nor does the central truth consist in the belief that God is associated or connected with human affairs. Under some aspects and in some degree many religions show traces of this profound intuition. Commonly it takes a very grotesque shape, as in the myths of oriental nations, or in the Iliad of Homer. Still the intuition lives, and its works. The Gods come down to men and mingle in human affairs, inflicting evils on some, on others bestowing favors. True, with these opinions we find mingled deistic sentiments, as in Epicurus. He and others taught that the Gods live in aerial regions a selfish life, having no concern for the well-being of men; yet even in Epicureanism the separation is partial rather than total. Scripture knows nothing of any deistic separation, everywhere asserting the close connection and the living sympathy of Deity with the human race; yet its chief aim is not to maintain the reality of a close connection between God and man, as affirmed by the religious consciousness of the world. But its aim is to reveal a fellowship of God with man in a new spiritual economy, an economy other than that which prevails by virtue of the original laws of human nature. Of this new economy, called by the Old Testament the covenant, and by the New the kingdom of heaven, the Word, the incarnate Word, is the principle and the ultimate end.

In maintaining that Jesus, the Christ, is the positive light of all Holy Scripture, we, on the one hand, deny that this light is a principle or doctrine common to Christianity and world religions; and, on the other hand, we affirm the one vitalizing reality which, more than any other truth or fact, distinguishes the Old and the New Testament from all other books.

The pre-incarnate Logos is the forthcoming, the revealing

God in the old creation and in the history of fallen mankind as truly as in the new creation. In Him were all things created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible. He is their Archetype.

All things were likewise created through Him, or by Him. The pre-incarnate Logos is the *organ*, the Mediator between the self-existent or unconditional being and all created or conditional existences; by Him the divine idea of the world became the real world.

Moreover, all things were created for Him, or unto Him. The Logos is the *end* for which the world was made. He is the Alpha and the Omega, the first One and the last One in the alphabet of history. Hence, all the kingdoms of the universe stand or hold together in Him. Transcendent, eternal, self-existent and personal, the Logos is also the universal *immanent* principle by whose upholding and governing activity all sub-human kingdoms are teleologically connected with man, their organic head, and all races in all ages are moving through a succession of epochs and periods towards Himself as their necessary and final consummation.*

The Archetype of the world, the Organ of its forthcoming into reality, and the final End of its manifold processes, the Logos shines into, and shines in human life universally; so far forth the ethical light of the natural conscience and the religious light of man's spirit are the same as the ethical and religious light of Scripture. But the light of the Logos in Scripture is not identical with the light of paganism. The one is the light of the Logos in process of coming into the world as Son of Man, the other is the light of the Logos incarnate in the person of the Christ. The truth of paganism is in positive sympathy with the truth of messianic revelation; but the two differ from each other as greatly as the last Adam differs from the first Adam, spirit from flesh, or quickening spirit from living soul. "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual." This significant passage

* Col. 1: 16-17.

may be given in paraphrase thus: he was not first who is the pneumatic man, the quickening spirit, but he was first who is the psychic man, or living soul: and afterward he who is quickening spirit, or the pneumatic man. First was formed from the dust of the ground by the inbreathing of God the psychic man, *εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*, who is of the earth earthy, and in the New Testament is often denoted by the term *flesh*, *σαρξ*. But in the fulness of time was begotten, not of the dust of the ground, but of psychic humanity, by the Holy Ghost overshadowing the virgin, the pneumatic Adam, *εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν*, who is of heaven, and in the New Testament is often distinguished from psychic humanity by the term spirit, *πνεῦμα*.

The light of the Logos shining in the first man Adam, and shining in humanity on the earthy plane of its history, is according to Paul "natural" or psychic light, being that kind and degree of divine truth of which humanity on the first and earthy plane of evolution was by its psychic constitution capable of being the receiver and the organ. But the light of the Logos shining in the last Adam, and shining in the second humanity on the heavenly plane of history, is the "spiritual" or pneumatic light, being that kind and degree of divine truth of which humanity on the second and heavenly plane of evolution is by its pneumatic constitution capable of being the receiver and the organ.

The psychic Adam conditions the pneumatic Adam, or the first man conditions the second man. The second pre-supposes the first, and appropriates his nature. The nature of the first humanity does not of itself become spiritual; yet the last Adam, or the spiritual humanity is founded on the psychic humanity. Quickenings Spirit takes up living soul into Himself creating living soul anew agreeably to its own inmost necessities.

Pneumatic manhood moving on the heavenly plane of world-history is the differentiated light, the sun of final truth. In the Old Testament this is the day-spring gilding the eastern horizon; in the New it scatters the clouds of the morning, and mounts into the zenith as the king of the day, the Messianic day which

all the æons of "the natural," or the psychic humanity, were foreshadowing.

That the last Adam or the Logos incarnate, is the distinctive truth as well of the Old as of the New Testament these volumes clearly teach. They disclaim to be merely a republication of moral and religious truths, otherwise accessible to belief and intelligence. Instead, they directly profess to proclaim the Son of Man, the one absolute light of the world.

Let us give attention to a few passages. Our Lord says of Himself: All things have been delivered unto me of my Father and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.* All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that He taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you.† Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in Himself, even so gave He to the Son also to have life in Himself; and He gave Him authority to execute ‡ judgment, because He is the Son of Man. I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by Me. If ye had known Me, ye would have known my Father also: from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him. § Again, therefore, Jesus spake unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life. || I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in the darkness. ¶

Like many others of the same import, these passages represent unequivocally the unique claim asserted by the Christ. He declares that He is Himself the whole truth of the gospel, thus affirming the qualitative difference between Scripture truth and all other moral and religious truth.

The Apostles, in the Acts and in their Epistles, assert

* Matt. 11: 27.

† John 15: 16.

‡ John 5: 25-27.

§ John 14: 6, 7.

|| John 16: 12.

¶ John 12: 48.

the same claim. Jesus and the resurrection was the great theme of all apostolic preaching.* There was no other name under heaven given among men, whereby they must be saved.† To His followers Jesus was the object of devotion and adoration, the foundation of their hopes, the source of their joys. It was their meat to live in Him and live for Him. For Him they were willing to die. What things had been gain to them they counted loss for Christ.‡ With this conception concerning Jesus Christ, all the utterances of St. Paul and of the other apostles are in perfect accord. Indeed, there is not a sentence in the New Testament conflicting with the idea that Jesus is the Christ of God, and that the Christ is the foundation truth of Scripture.

That the Messianic idea is likewise the light of the Old Testament is equally manifest. Jesus claims to be the interior sense of what is written in the law and the prophets. He came not to destroy but to fulfill. The sacred writings of Moses and the prophets He interprets in relation to Himself. According to the words of His discourse, recorded in John 5: 19-47, the chief theme on which the great lawgiver wrote when the ceremonial economy with its tabernacle, its priesthood and its sacrifices was instituted, was not Aaron, not the ark of the covenant, not lambs and goats to be slain and offered on the altar, but it was the Son of Man, the Prophet of whom Moses was the type. He was the spiritual significance of the Mosaic ritual. In full harmony with this utterance about the writings of Moses, Jesus says of Abraham that he "rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it and was glad." §

What our Lord says respecting the books of Moses in their relation to Himself, He likewise asserts of the writings of all the Old Testament prophets. St. Luke records that Jesus took unto Him the twelve and said unto them: "Behold we go up to Jerusalem and all the things that are written by the prophets

* Acts 4: 2; 17: 18.

† Phil. 3: 8.

‡ Acts 4: 12.

§ John 8: 57.

shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man." * Still more explicit is the record of the conversation of our Lord with the two disciples walking towards Emmaus: "Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." † Not only do some prophets anticipate the Christ, nor do they speak of Him only in some prophecies, but the things concerning Himself, the risen Jesus discerns in *all* the Scriptures. Whatever chosen men, moved by the Holy Ghost, wrote afore, in the progress of revelation among the covenant people, whether by them understood to be of the promised Seed of Abraham or not, was written, as our Lord expressly teaches, concerning the Christ.

The same doctrine comes to view in other New Testament books. In proclaiming the gospel to the Jews this was the most prominent idea of the apostles: that Jesus of Nazareth was the hope of Israel, the Christ of God, the great Prophet announced by Moses and anticipated by all the Old Testament writers. He was the end of the ceremonial law. In him were fulfilled the predictions of the Scriptures. He was the archetype of all the types given in the persons and histories of the patriarchs. The intent of the dealings of Jehovah with His chosen people culminates in the life and death of Jesus.

This, in few words, is the substance of apostolic teaching regarding the connection of Jesus with the Hebrew Scriptures. In some books, such as the Gospel According to St. Matthew, the Acts, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of Peter, this characteristic idea is specially prominent; but in no book and in no sentence is its intoning force wanting. The very pivot upon which the whole scheme of Christian doctrine, of Christian polity and Christian worship hinges, is the historical truth that the ceremonial law and the entire pre-Christian history of the chosen people was a schoolmaster to bring them unto the Christ, and that this Christ was Jesus, the crucified Nazarene.

* Luke 18: 31.

† Luke 24: 25-27.

To establish this proposition fully by argument would require extended quotations from the apostolic writings ; but I forbear. The general statement given of the teaching of the New Testament, respecting the import of the Hebrew Scriptures, may suffice.

Agreeably, then, to the explicit testimony which the Bible bears to itself, the positive light shining, as well in the pre-Christian as in the Christian Scriptures, is the Seed of Abraham, the Son of David, the Prince of Peace, the Bright and Morning Star, the King of the Jews, the Only-Begotten of the Father, Jesus of Nazareth, who is the First and the Last, the Resurrection and the Life, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever.

But it is necessary and important to distinguish the luminous centre of the Written Word from other lights which this luminous centre is ever kindling. I shall confine myself to the consideration of personality, in distinction from truth in the intelligence and truth in the will, or divine knowledge and divine character.

Thus distinguished, we get the ground-principle from which is evolved, as from a germ, the entire organism of revealed truth. This ground-principle imparts self-authenticating force to the canonical books of the Old and New Testament.

These several particulars remain to be briefly discussed.

1. The central principle of all Holy Scripture is the *personal* Truth. In the Old Testament it is not a doctrine respecting the coming Messiah. Nor in the New Testament is it a doctrine concerning man and the way of salvation. Nor is it a doctrine taught by Christ concerning Himself or the Father, or the Holy Ghost.

Doctrinal teaching Scripture certainly contains. It expresses, in words, the life and mission of the Christ. In Him are represented the relations, the holiness and the love of Almighty God. Scripture also distinguishes between correct and incorrect conceptions respecting the person and the mission of the Christ, enforcing the one and condemning the other. Yet doc-

trine, as doctrine, is not its luminous centre. All teaching respecting the Christ presumes Himself, the Word made flesh, as the primordial and vitalizing law. The recorded events are many; many the doctrines; many, also, the errors of opinion and practice which are condemned. But the teleology of all events and the import of all teaching is the union of God and man in a person.

Nor may we distinguish between our Lord's wisdom and His inimitable teaching, and then affirm that His mind, His extraordinary intelligence, is the light of Scripture. He claims to know God and to know the world more profoundly and comprehensively than the world or God is known by science and philosophy, or by pagan religions or the Jewish rabbis. Of man, of his spiritual capacities, and ultimate end He proclaims new conceptions, conceptions which until He uttered them never entered the mind of heathen sage or Hebrew seer. Such knowledge, such insight is pure light. Contrasted with the ignorance and superstitions of paganism, contrasted with the deistic monotheism of Rabbinism, it is a light most needful and healthful. Scripture records this vast knowledge, this profound insight, this new wisdom. But such deep and broad intelligence is the reflected radiance of the true light. Scripture seeks not merely so to enlighten our minds that we may know Christ's wisdom, but it sets forth the God-man, the personal Christ Himself, in order that He and His people may be one spiritual communion. Hence in order that men may be illumined by the light of our Lord's knowledge, more is requisite than the diligent application of the intellect to the Written Word or earnest rational inquiry into its history and structure. The use of the intellect and the logical processes of the reason are neither the only nor the chief conditions on which depend a knowledge of the Bible. As regards things external and material, perception must precede reflection. In the sphere of mathematical science intuitions and axioms condition at all points the process of demonstration. This law asserts itself just as authoritatively in the spiritual kingdom. The percep-

tion of things spiritual goes before all correct intellectual conceptions. That men may gain an insight into the wealth of Christ's knowledge, they must share His spirituality, the heavenly-mindedness which He possesses; but in order to share His spirituality of mind they must live His life-communion of love with God. If through the Holy Ghost they by faith possess Him, they may through the heavenly qualifications imparted by possessing Him, be enabled to drink of the fountain of divine knowledge and human knowledge which He is.

2. Neither is the light of Scripture the holy will of our Lord, nor His spotless moral character.

In one respect, His will is identical with His personality. His person was freely active in willing the right and doing the right. But personality includes more than volition, authority and righteousness. The Christ is ethically good—the immaculate One—the only Man in the history of our race who presents the perfect pattern of true godliness and faultless morality. His holiness and purity and righteousness, inflamed by the fire of love to God and love to man, is the cloudless radiance of the absolute good. Before its splendor the excellence of all other great and noble men grows pale. Yet Scripture does not merely lay down His will as the true law for the will of all men, nor set forth His spotless character as the ideal of the best morality. Scripture not only proclaims His noble life as the model, but presents the Christ Himself as the necessity for the world.

The Christ is the necessity which is primary and perpetual. Scripture requires indeed that men fulfill His will. Says our Lord: If ye love me keep my commandments. No one refusing to obey His will can see the true light. A man of selfish will, antagonistic to the authority of the Christ, or of an understanding decidedly averse to the example of His righteousness, is by such antagonism and aversion, incapable of appreciating His example or acknowledging His authority. The spiritual eye is blinded. Nevertheless, positive as may be the authority of Christ expressed by His commandments, and unconditionally

necessary as it may be to honor them, that authority is not the one central truth. That very authority, those very commandments, pre-suppose and require the recognition of Himself as the source of authority and the vitalizing truth of His commandments. Men may conform to Christ's will and reflect His heavenly virtue, if they possess the moral power that lives in Him; but that they may possess this moral power it is needful that He and they be one.

The person of Christ illumines His own words, illumines His commands, His miracles, and the cardinal facts of His redemptive work. His teaching respecting His death on the cross, respecting His resurrection from the dead, His glorification at the right hand of the Father, and the mystery of His second coming turn on their relation to the unity of the divine nature and the human nature in His constitution. Divorced from this mystery of mysteries, no event in His history on earth or in heaven is intelligible. The person of Christ likewise illumines the authority of His will, and the rewards of glory following from obedience to His authority. He illumines every prohibition, the terrific condemnation of scribes and pharisees for their unbelief, and the penalties of suffering, here and hereafter, which ensue upon the rejection of His claims. Neither the consequences of unbelief, nor the guilt of transgressing the moral law, nor the miseries entailed by transgression and unbelief are intelligible, except as the eye of thought sees the unbelief and transgression in their relation to Himself as the consummate realization of the good. Christ and personal fellowship with Christ condition all true knowledge of the spiritual world.

3. The person of Christ is the light of the books of Holy Scripture contemplated as literary productions.

The truth of God is taught in the words of man. Human speech in the Written Word is truly human, conforming to the principles of grammar and rhetoric, conforming also to the laws and categories of thought. In these sacred books human factors are as real and conspicuous as they are in any unin-

spired work of genius. The author, be he law-giver or historian or seer, be he evangelist or apostle or chosen teacher, imprints on his production the civil status of his age and country, the social customs of the people, the epoch of his religious life, his culture or lack of culture, his modes of thought, his temperament, and other individual traits. Especially does he imprint his conception of the central truth of revelation. To these human elements woven into the web of inspired literature, the exposition of Scripture must always pay due regard. But the study of these human elements does not reveal the spiritual import of Holy Writ. Greek words in the New Testament have a meaning, have a reason, which these same words do not have in Greek literature. True, the ordinary popular or classic usage of a word is not superseded: common usage by a new birth of the Spirit becomes the bearer of a heavenly meaning. Whilst the knowledge of the one is a requisite qualification of the interpreter that he may attain to a knowledge of the other, such classic scholarship is by itself inadequate.

Were the import of Scripture language classical and human only, then evidently ordinary natural resources would suffice. The knowledge of the Hebrew and the Greek tongues connected with skill in interpretation would meet all the conditions of the task. A scholar might then approach the Psalms of David as he approaches the odes of Pindar; the historical records given in the Books of Kings and of Samuel, or of Chronicles, as he does the annals of Tacitus; and read the four biographies of our Lord as he reads Plutarch's Lives. Thus coming to the study of Holy Scripture on the presumption that the entire import is human and natural the interpreter will get a sense corresponding to his preconceived opinion. Guided only by his knowledge of Hebrew, or classic Greek, he will naturally find the sense merely human and earthly.

But Scripture professes to be a word of divine origin. It claims to teach, not things earthly, but heavenly verities; not the events of human history nor the phenomena of the natural world, but to teach the facts of supernatural revelation and the realities of the spiritual world. According to its own professions,

the true import of Scripture is generically different from the ordinary import of the human words which the writers employed. The essential truth is not earthly but heavenly, not human but divine. It belongs not to the natural economy, but to a spiritual economy—a kingdom in which the divine-human personality of the Christ is central. If we respect this claim, if we approach the study of Scripture on the strength of its own presumption, then conditions of interpretation other than the knowledge of language, and of the civil and social conditions of the age when this or that canonical book was written, are evidently requisite. However important Hebrew scholarship and Greek scholarship may be; however great the light shed upon the original text by acquaintance with manners and customs, geography and history, yet these aids are of no account unless complemented by what is more fundamental and essential, namely, the perception of the interior heavenly meaning of the Old and New Testament, a meaning imparted by Him who claims to be the solar light of all messianic revelation, the substance of all truth.

The qualification for the student of Scripture needful above all others, and without which all other qualifications are unavailing, is a spiritual mind, a mind in positive sympathy with the personal Truth. He needs an eye to discern the *Logos* incarnate as the beginning and the end of all history, of the decalogue and the ceremonial law, of all prophecies and all fulfillments, of every precept and every promise, and of every doctrine respecting God and man, respecting sin and redemption, death and hell, salvation and eternal life, taught by evangelists and apostles or Moses and the prophets.

4. The positive light of all the canonical books being Jesus, the Christ of God, not religious doctrine nor moral law, Scripture is self-evidencing, as the natural sun to the bodily eye; not self-evidencing to one who may be an upright man, nor to one who may have truly religious susceptibilities, but to him who has an eye to see the luminous centre of pre-Christian and Christian revelation.

One who presumes that ethical truth is the noblest order

of truth that any book may teach, will probably discover in the Bible only the purest principles of ethics and the best precepts for moral conduct. He will fail to recognize the internal connection of every ethical principle and every precept with the person of the Son of Man. The Bible may thus authenticate to his æsthetic perception the beauty and grandeur of one of its outer courts, but not the Holy of Holies. The King of kings whose will is reflected in the eternal appointments of His temple he does not recognize.

The man who assumes that Christianity is in kind identical with all religions, but differs from others in degree of excellence, will most likely see in Scripture the best product of natural religious aspiration. In its pages he may find one personal God, an all-wise providence, the immortality of the soul, the propriety of worship. He may read there the great religious and ethical ideas ruling in the development of ethnic religions. To his mind, what in these religions is obscure Scripture may illumine, what is defective it may supplement. Errors and superstitions are according to his judgment dissipated, and the purest rational religion, a religion answering to the dictates of reason is taught with simplicity and force, and beautifully exemplified by the pure character and noble conduct of the greatest religious Teacher. Reading the Written Word with the natural religious eye only, he may behold some of its presuppositions, but the new spiritual truth luminous in its pages he does not discover. Even a better religion than mankind had ever projected he may acknowledge; but Christianity lies beyond the scope of his vision. He does not see the interior sense of pre-Christian history; not the Son of God come in the flesh; nor the propitiation for the sin of the world; nor life and immortality brought to light by the resurrection from the dead of the crucified One; nor the blessedness of heaven. To him Scripture may even be the best of all books. Yet the glory of its great truths is hidden from his sight. It does not bear testimony to Him of itself as the Word of God; and for the reason that he has no eye to see the light of life, the true and faithful Witness.

II.

THE ANCIENT ORACLE.

BY H. P. LAIRD, ESQ.

IF we deny the supernatural character of this ancient document, the difficulty is not removed. On such an hypothesis we must account, in a rational way, not only for the precise and systematic statement of the devolution, which proceeding from stage to stage binds the whole and all its parts in one fixed harmony; but also for the several facts therein contained, which have been verified by scientific investigation. We cannot escape from the dilemma by assuming that there are other facts in the narrative, not corroborated, and which appear to us in our present state of knowledge to be inconsistent with a rational cosmogony. Thousands of years passed after this document was in existence before a single fact enumerated had been verified. It is now known that several of the most important facts stated in the narrative are true. The facts stated are not isolated, they are coherent parts of one rounded whole; all necessary to complete the cosmogonic conception of the Author. Under such circumstances where several of the cohering facts are proven, the conviction thence arising is not limited to the particular facts established, but also sheds the lustre of *prima facie* truth over the whole series of facts embraced in the cosmogonic conception of the Author and in its details. Under such circumstances objections resting on inferences not based on known facts cannot shake our confidence in the measure of proof already attained. For eighteen hundred years this narrative has been open to adverse criticism, and yet not a single fact stated has been disproved. I am aware that this proposition is not universally conceded, but the weight of the evidence

is favorable to such a conclusion. This venerable record is the corner-stone of an edifice which has set aside the speculations of the wisest and most profound Pagan philosophers in regard to the origin of the world. Longinus (born say A.D. 210), and versed in all the philosophical learning of the age in which he lived, complimented the majesty and sublimity of a portion of its diction, and his pupil, Porphyry, expended much of his great ability in a studied effort to shake confidence in Jewish and Christian revelation. The pretensions of this narrative we may fairly infer were critically discussed by Porphyry and others in that age, and in all the succeeding ages; and yet it remains unshaken. Philosophers can point out errors committed by Plato and Aristotle, the great lights of the best days of Greek culture; but no scientist can lay his hand on any *data* certainly in conflict with this record. Partly corroborated and never contradicted, this sublime account of the creation, so complete in all its details, challenges our wonder and admiration. Sir Isaac Newton at the close of his great work, the *Principia*, upon the hypothesis that the fixed stars were the centres of systems, similar to our solar system, said *Hæc omnia simili consilio suberunt Unius dominio*. Such was the testimony of the great mathematician as against the dualism of the Persians, and as against the polytheism of all the other pagan nations. But the Mosaic record had proclaimed all this ages before, in language of loftiest sublimity.

James Hutton (born 1726), the founder of geological science, in 1796 published a "Theory of the Earth" in which he taught, that in the material from which geological evidence is to be compiled there can be found "no traces of a beginning, no prospect of an end." Such an authoritative statement coming from one who was known to have devoted many years to geological research, and who was the acknowledged peer of any man of his day in learning and ability, created a sensation and opened up a wide field of controversy. Playfair, the mathematician and biographer of Hutton, defended his views and said: "The Author of Nature has not given laws to the universe which like the insti-

tutions of men, carry in themselves the elements of their own destruction. He has not permitted in His works any symptoms of infancy, or of old age, or any signs by which we may estimate either their future or their past duration." In less than one hundred years all this beautiful rhetoric has been dissipated, and in opposition to Hutton's views and those of his biographer it is now universally admitted by all leading geologists that there was a time when there was neither vegetable nor animal life on the planet. And even the argument of Playfair is no longer accepted as a correct deduction from known facts. The moon is practically dead, our earth is parting with her internal heat, and her waters are becoming solidified with the rocks or massed in the polar regions and will finally disappear in a fluid form from the surface. Mathematicians as able as Playfair count the years of the sun and the probable duration of her fiery life, based upon an estimate of the rate at which she is contracting and parting with her heat. The truth of what the Psalmist said is no longer doubted in intelligent circles. "They shall perish—yea all of them shall wax old like a garment," cii. 26. Paul repeated the same idea, Hebrews i. 11. How comes it that science when it reaches the bottom facts never can be made to contradict these inspired utterances? The Mosaic record if believed was plenary authority for the fact that there was a time in the life of this planet when all was waste, desolate and devoid of life; but the philosophers of the eighteenth century who preferred to accept the views of Hutton, claimed that the present order of things had no beginning and that there was no evidence that it would have an end. How are we to explain the fact that the Lawgiver of Israel was able to announce the genesis of vegetable and animal life several thousand years in advance of the most enlightened and learned scientists of Western Europe? The Laurentian rocks wherever found demonstrate the truth of two of the fundamental facts stated in this narrative. First that the primeval earth was *tohu*, a desolation, and *bohu*, a waste; and, second, that there was a time in the history of the planet

when there was no form of vegetable or animal life on the planet. This record and scientific research are in harmony on this question. We further learn from the narrative that the primeval waters covered the faces of the earth. The geologist in his researches has found no fact to contradict this statement. Sir Charles Lyell conceded the fact that all the dry land had been covered with water; but his theory was that the waters of the oceans operating through countless ages in wearing down the land and the alternate elevation and submergence of the land itself would account for this. Principles of Geology, ninth edition, page 102, he said: "By these and other ceaseless changes, the configuration of the earth's surface has been remodeled again and again since it was the habitation of organic beings, and the bed of the ocean has been lifted up to the height of some of the loftiest mountains." His convictions were, no doubt, accepted by many persons as the only solution of an admitted fact, rather than the authoritative announcement contained in this narrative. Since Mr. Lyell penned this remarkable statement a flood of light has been thrown on this subject. The British government from 1873 to 1875 organized an expedition to investigate the deep waters of the oceans under the direction of John Murry in command of the "Challenger" and accompanying vessels "Lightning" and "Porcupine." He says in summarizing: "If it be proved that in the sedimentary strata the true pelagic sediments are not represented, it follows that deep and extended oceans like those of the present day cannot formerly have occupied the areas of the present continents, and as a corollary the great lines of the oceanic basins and continents must have been marked out from the earliest geological ages. . . . It is indeed almost beyond question that the red clay regions of the Central Pacific contain accumulations belonging to geological ages different from our own."—Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 18, page 124. Dr. W. B. Carpenter, C. B., who accompanied the expedition, made a report on the "Atlantic," of which a summary is given in Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 3. In dis-

cussing the question of the persistence of the deep-sea beds he says, pages 17-18: "It will be presently shown that this idea of the existence of an Atlantic basin corresponding generally to that now existing, as far back as the later secondary period, is strongly supported by the evidence recently obtained of the continuity of animal life on the Atlantic sea-board from the cretaceous epoch to the present time." On page 16 he says: "And Prof. Dana, who more than any other geologist has studied the structure of the existing continents and the succession of changes concerned in their elevation, has been led by the consideration of the probable direction of the forces by which that elevation was effected, to conclude that the defining of the present continental and oceanic areas began with the commencement of the solidification of the earth's crust. . . . In the opinion of Prof. Dana there has never been any essential change in the relations of these great features."

From these considerations the weight of the scientific evidence preponderates in favor of the conclusion that the continents as now outlined and the deep ocean beds have not suffered any considerable change from the first appearance of organic life on this planet. Such conclusion, however, does not militate against the almost universal belief that at some period in the life of the planet the waters did cover the whole face of the earth, but it implies the conviction that this condition of the planet being before the existence of organic life is responsive to the statement in the Mosaic narrative, and thus by a chain of reasoning based upon observed facts the conclusion is reached that the primeval waters did cover the faces of the earth. But the narrative further says that the primeval waters were collected together to one place. The observed facts confirm this statement. One can take a ship at New York, and, without landing, traverse all the oceans on the globe. How did the author of this narrative know that the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Arctic, the Ant-Arctic and the Indian oceans were substantially one body of water?

The geologic record has not yet determined whether vegetable

or animal life first began on this planet. The Mosaic record distinctly affirms the precedence of the former.

The Mosaic narrative is clear and explicit in stating that the higher forms of animal life, including man, were brought into existence in the latest stages of the creative period. The general tenor of the geologic record appears to support this view.

The Mosaic record teaches that a single pair, one man and one woman, were the progenitors of the whole race of men. The highest scientific authorities—Blumenbach, Prichard, Quatrefages and Darwin—maintain the same doctrine.

E. B. Taylor, LL.D., Ency. Brit., Vol. II, page 114, says, "On the whole it may be asserted that the doctrine of the unity of mankind now stands on a firmer basis than in previous ages." This ancient oracle careless of human criticism, and in the presence of many facts tending to a different conclusion assumed the responsibility of proclaiming the unity of the human race. And in after ages, Paul, standing on Mars' Hill, in the presence of Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, in the centre of Athenian culture, reiterated the same doctrine without contradiction. How shall we account for the unshaken confidence with which both assertions were made, in advance of any actual scientific investigation of the subject? The Mosaic record emphasises as a fact that each form of life, vegetable and animal, was created *lemino* for his kind and *leminah* for her kind. According to this record *min*, species, is founded in nature. This fact has been called in question by a few individuals; but the position assumed by them is so much at variance with the general observation of mankind that it has gained but little credence. Sir Charles Lyell, who spent many years in geological research in Principles of Geology, ninth edition, points out the fallacy of the arguments adduced against the doctrine of the permanence of *species*, and J. G. Romanes, F.R.S., in an able article on Hybridism, Ency. Brit., Vol. XII, page 425, says, "Indeed it is doubtful whether there is any single instance of a perfectly fertile hybrid having emanated from a cross between two animal species;" and again, "all one can say with

certainly is that in animals, as in plants, no authentic instance is on record of progeny resulting from a union of two individuals separated from one another by more than a generic distinction." These observations of Romanes were made in reference to Mr. Darwin's summation of what he claimed was evidence against the doctrine of permanence of *species*, and from whom he had largely quoted. While the author of this narrative might have known from observation the inherent persistence of the distinction between the different animal species, yet we cannot fairly assume that he had such practical knowledge in regard to plant propagation. From the prominence given to this peculiarity of creation one is led to infer that the author regarded this feature of creation as an ineradicable law, embracing not only the parent stock, but also all succeeding generations of animal and vegetable life. Any further discussion of the contention growing out of this part of the narrative would lead me aside from the purpose of this article.

In view of the remarkable agreement between the Mosaic record and the facts of science in the several instances already enumerated or hereinafter discussed this ancient oracle becomes invested with a profound interest. The correlated facts of science and this narrative which have been discussed, or to be discussed, may thus be summed up.

Data of the narrative scientifically verified:

1. The universal dominion of One.
2. An Azoic period when there was no vegetable life on the planet.
3. An Azoic period when there was no animal life on the planet.
4. A beginning of vegetable life.
5. A beginning of animal life.
6. The highest forms of animal life including man brought into existence at a late stage of the creative period.
7. The whole earth covered with water.
8. The waters gathered into one body.

Data of the narrative supported by the preponderant weight of scientific authority:

1. A single pair the progenitors of the human race.
2. *Min*, vegetable species founded in nature.

3. *Min*, animal species founded in nature.
4. The permanence of the vegetable and animal species.
5. The geological history of the earth antedates the sun's heat.

It will be observed that all these remarkable coincidences exist independent of the contention as to the priority of vegetable or animal life and independent of the contention as to the priority of life originating in the water and life originating on the land. The questions here involved are important. Geology has not yet settled them; and the recent 1873 to 1875 exploring expedition of the *Challenger*, *Porcupine* and *Lightning*, in the deep and shore-line waters of the Pacific and Atlantic oceans seems to indicate that the certitude heretofore attached to the finding of a fossil plant or animal in a particular locality could no longer be relied upon as absolutely fixing the relative period of its appearance among the orders of life, vegetable or animal.

Before entering upon a more specific discussion of this wonderful narrative it is here in place to advert to a grammatical and philological question which has some bearing on the right understanding of the narrative. The Hebrew particle *eth* occurs more than twenty times in this chapter and also in other places in the Scriptures. In this narrative in fourteen or fifteen instances it stands before a noun having the definite article governed by an active verb. It is said that under such circumstances it is a sign of the accusative case and not translatable; but I have seen no satisfactory reason assigned for such a conclusion. It would be a difficult task to convince one that this concise account of the greatest event in the history of the material world was weighted down with an oft-recurrent grammatical sign. The unequalled power of the author in comprehending in a single survey a vast circle of complicated facts and binding them together in unity, so as to form one whole responsive to the orderly world of things exhibited in nature, forbids the inference that he used any word or particle of speech not intended to express some designed shade of qualification or limitation. It is perhaps well that there is not

an unbroken current of authority on the import of the particle *eth* when it precedes a noun having the definite article governed by an active verb, and hence we may yet hope that some competent Oriental scholar will arise who will give us the grammatical law of the *eth*. John Parkhurst, the author of a Hebrew and Chaldaic grammar and Hebrew Lexicon, published in 1829, said of this particle, page 85, "the Lexicons say that when joined with a verb it (the *eth*) denotes the *accusative case*, if the verb be active; but the *nominative* if the verb be passive or neuter. But in truth it is the sign of no particular case, that distinction being unknown in Hebrew." I have omitted the several references of the author in illustration of his position. That the real value of the Hebrew particle *eth* is still obscured by uncertainty I may refer to the various translations of the first verse of the fourth chapter of Genesis, "And she said I have gotten a man *eth Yah-we*," which Luther translated *Ich habe den Mann, den Herrn*. But the Vulgate translated *Possedi hominem per Deum*, and the authorized English version has it, "and said I have gotten a man from the Lord." All of these three translations cannot represent the true idea of the Hebrew original; and judging from the unprofitable and inconclusive discussions which have been had in reference to the meaning of this declaration of the mother of all living, is it not possible even in this nineteenth century that neither of them may? It is strange that no one of the commentators has thought of permitting Eve in the hour of her joy in a thoughtless, self-reliant way to speak like a woman. It appears possible that this self-dependent utterance of the mother on such an occasion prophetically cast its dark shadow on the future life and fatal deed of her first-born son. *Eth* in Hebrew is used in various senses like *en* in French, which is both a pronoun and a preposition. Thus *en* in French sometimes means *like* after the manner of *agir en roi* to act like a king. Hence the sentence referred to may be construed, "I have gotten a man *proxima Deo*," in allusion to the creation of Adam. Enough has been said on the subject

of this Hebrew particle to show that the philological and grammatical value of the *eth* has yet to be determined.

In entering upon a further discussion of this wonderful cosmogonic treatise, of course I cannot escape the embarrassment which presents itself, in having to deal with one term in the narrative, the *eth* which has never been fully solved. Apart, however, from the proper modifying effect of this particle, the general current of the narrative is so clear and explicit when attentively considered, that I apprehend there is but little room for divergence of construction. Taking up the narrative in its order, the first thing which arrests attention is the colossal grandeur of the opening sentence, which has unveiled an otherwise insoluble mystery, and in connection with this, as the narrative progresses, the harmonious blending of a description of the whole and of a part. As no part of this stupendous Fabric of the Universe can be sundered from the whole, so here where the description necessarily involves the relation of this globe to other worlds, there the narrative like the fixed harmony of the Universe follows the drama and contrivance of God's design, and blends the whole and the part together in mutual harmony.

In beginning God created *eth* It, the heavens and *eth* It, the *erets*.

And the *erets* was without form and void and darkness was upon the faces of the deep.

And the Spirit of God moved upon the faces of the waters.

And God said, Let there be light and there was light. And God saw the light that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.

And God called the light *yom* and the darkness he called *layela*, and was evening and was morning day ONE.

And God said: Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

And God made the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so.

And God called the firmament heaven; and was evening and was morning day SECOND.

This narrative, from whatever source derived, aims to furnish an account of the origin of things. We are easily convinced that the first verse is not a caption to the narrative; but that it is intended to point out how the substance of the material *hypostasis* of which the Universe is composed first began to be. The discussion is in reference to origins, and, hence, it would be illogical to refer the *resith* to time. God created *eth* It, the substance of which the heavens and the *erets* are composed *Be-resith* in heading that is in origin. And the *erets* the gross undistinguishable mass, was a desolation and a waste, and darkness was upon the faces of the *tehom*, deep. Thus we find this term *tehom* applied to the abysmal desolation of chaos before there was any discrete terrestrial ocean or sea. In Proverbs 8th chap., 26th verse, in reference to the antiquity of *Wisdom* it is said, "While as yet He had not made the earth nor the fields, nor the *rosh apharoth tebel*, the head clods of the world, or primeval dust," I was there. In Proverbs it is the concrete term that is used; in this narrative the abstract *resith*. The term in the first verse which rules the construction is "In beginning." Thus God created It, the heavens and It, the *erets*, "in beginning." That is in its primary stage of becoming. Having reached the conclusion that *erets*, earth in the first verse is a generic term intended to embrace earthy substance wherever existing as opposed to *sammayim*, gaseous substance, this term *erets* in the second verse must be held to be of the same import as the *erets* of the first verse. Hence it follows that the second and third verses are a grand and sublime description of chaos of unsurpassed comprehensiveness and brevity, and that from the first to the eighth verse inclusive the description is cosmical and appertains to the one grand harmonious system of things in process of assuming the orderly arrangement of a completed world. It is not until the tenth verse that the term *erets* is specifically applied to this planet, and, hence, in the description subsequent thereto wherever the word *erets*,

earth occurs it must be held to import *erets*, earth, as defined in the tenth verse.

That portion of the narrative embraced in the first eight verses being cosmical and a singular fact but once occurring, lies beyond the sphere of our observation, and above the power of either adverse or friendly criticism. Still the order of the events narrated and their correlation with co-existent facts call for observation. The dark chaotic mass becomes illuminated. It is the morning of the first day. By instrumentalities not described alternation between the light and the shades of evening darkness periodically occurred. The morning of the first day is followed by an evening, and that evening by the morning of the second day, a completed cyclicality, described as the *yom echad*, or day first, and in the same way the day is counted from morning to morning throughout the six divine creative days; the last of the six terminating on the morning of the seventh day. The creative days antedate the luminaries which measure terrestrial time, and hence are measured in each case by a series of divine creative operations, and not otherwise.

We can only know from the narrative itself, that the creative operations were divided into six periods, and that the close of each period was marked like the declining day by a phenomenal evening, followed by another morning brilliant as the first. It was the Light which constituted the day. No revolving sphere abruptly interrupted its continuity. Full high above the discordant elements its lustre illuminated every stage of the creative process, gently assuming evening shades, after indefinite intervals, followed by another morning like the first.

The operations of the second day were the making of the expanse to divide the waters from the waters. And here it is said, 7th verse, "And God made It the expanse, and caused to divide between the waters which from under to—the—expanse, and between the waters which from—upon to the—expanse, and was so. And God called the expanse heavens, and was evening and was morning the second day." It would require a more extensive knowledge than I possess, of the Hebrew

idiom to determine just what this 7th verse means. Is it the office of the expanse to cause a division between the waters beneath the expanse, and also to cause a division between the waters above the expanse, literally from—upon to—the expanse? Or is it limited according to the English translation, to divide “the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament?” If the first construction is to prevail, then we can see foreshadowed here the beautiful arrangement of Providence which causes the waters of the ocean to be divided and taken up particle by particle into the surrounding atmosphere to water the earth. As to the mode in which the expanse effects the same thing on the waters above, it is not necessary here to inquire. The operations of this second day, like those of the first, were probably marked by an axial rotation of the sphere, evidenced by a recurrent evening and morning, which marks each of the six creative periods.

“And God said, Let the waters from under the heavens be gathered together unto one place and let the dry (land) appear, and it was so.

“And God called the dry (land) *erets*, Earth, and the collection of the waters called *He seas*, and God saw that it was good.

“And God said, Let the *erets*, Earth, bring forth vegetation (*dese*), the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth; and it was so.

“And the earth brought forth vegetation, herb yielding seed after his kind and tree yielding fruit whose seed in itself after his kind. And God saw that it was good, and was evening and was morning day, THIRD.”

The description of the genesis of vegetable life at the beginning of the third period like the other parts of the narrative is suitable to the dignity of the Creator. There is nothing in the narrative to limit this genetic process to the period of its inception. Hence, it may be fairly inferred that it continued in an ever-ascending order of great diversity from the beginning

of the third period until the close of the sixth creative period; some plants becoming extinct, and other orders taking their place and where the plants were enduring and persistent, they would be found associated in a fossil state with the lowest and other forms of animal life, although widely separated in origin and time. The facts of Botany and Geology corroborate such inference. Thallogens, a persistent vegetable tribe, Acrogens, Gymnogens, Monocotyledons, found in the silurian, Old Red, and carboniferous strata, Radiata, Aticulata, Fishes and Reptiles, found associated in a fossil state in the same order of strata. It therefore occasions no surprise that neither botanical nor geological research has been able to draw from the meagre volume of fossil remains a sharp line of distinction between the beginning of vegetable and animal life on this planet. The great command "Let the earth bring forth vegetation, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind" ran through the whole creative period; nor does it militate against the accuracy of this narrative, that the Graminæ, as now understood by botanists, are not found among the earliest vegetable fossils. St. Jerome who translated this chapter with the assistance of Hebrew Rabbis into Latin under the shadow of the walls of Bethlehem uses these terms: *Et ait: Germinet terra herbam virentem et facientem semen, et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum juxta genus suum.* The Hebrew verb is *dasa* and the noun *dese*; both are used and belong to one and the same root form. Literally let the earth shoot forth shoots. To translate *dese* "grass" is interpretation, not translation. Hugh Miller, "Testimony of the Rocks," page 78, said: "The true *grasses*—a still more important order, which as the corn-bearing plants of the agriculturist, feed at the present time at least two-thirds of the human species, and in their humbler varieties form the staple food of the grazing animals—scarce appear in the fossil state at all. They are peculiarly plants of the human period. Again, he said, same page, "The singularly profuse vegetation of the coal measures was with all its wild luxuriance of a resembling cast. So far as appears,

neither flock nor herd, could have lived on its greenest and richest plains . . . Not until we enter on the Tertiary period, do we find floras, amid which man might have profitably labored, as a dresser of gardens, a tiller of fields or a keeper of flocks and herds."

This narrative in announcing the genesis of vegetable life before the economy of the present constitution of the world was settled anticipated the coming verdict of the most advanced thinkers. The Author careless of contradiction or criticism asserted that vegetable-life began in an environment differing from the existing constitution of Nature. Prof. Hæckle of Jena, "*History of Creation*," vol. 1, pp. 341-342 says, "For how can we know that in remote primeval times there did not exist conditions quite different from those at present obtaining, and which may have rendered spontaneous generation possible. . . . Indeed we can maintain that the general conditions of life in primeval times must have been entirely different from those of the present time." And Archibald Geikie, Professor of Geology in Edinburgh in an article furnished for the *Ency. Brit.*, vol. 10, page 213 said "We must be obviously on our guard against the danger of unconsciously assuming that the phase of nature's operations which we now witness has been the same in all past times, and the few centuries wherein man has been observing nature form much too brief an interval, by which to measure the intensity of geological action in all past time." These confessions come late; but nevertheless they unconsciously compliment the truthfulness of the Mosaic Record, which had announced the beginning of vegetable life under conditions which do not now obtain.

1. "And God made two great lights. The greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night; the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth and to rule over the day, and over the night; and to divide the light from the darkness, and God saw that it was good, and was evening and was morning day the **FOURTH.**"

This part of the narrative has been often assailed. That there should have been vegetable life, before the existence of the sun is deemed by some to be incredible. It is certain that the author of this narrative did not court unbelief in his statements. If he had written from a human stand-point this part of the cosmogony would have been arranged more in conformity with human convictions. That this globe should have existed before the sun and have been the theater of an exuberant vegetation, strikes the superficial observer with astonishment. He forms his conclusions based on the existing order of nature. But the deep thought of the world perceiving the impossibility of accounting for the beginning of vegetable and animal life on this planet under the present economy of nature has abandoned this plausible but superficial position. Prof. Hæckle, *Hist. Creation*, vol. 1, pages 341-342 says: "Think only of the fact of the enormous masses of carbon which we now find deposited in the primary coal mountains, and at that time under conditions quite different from those of to-day, a spontaneous generation which now is perhaps no longer possible, may have taken place." Hugh Miller, *Testimony of the Rocks*, page 57 said, "The flora of the coal measures was the richest and most luxuriant in at least individual productions, with which the fossil botanist has formed any acquaintance." And even Sir Charles Lyell who hardly ever failed to insist on the uniformity of the laws of nature, in *Principles of Geology*, 9th Edition, page 87 was constrained to say "But it is from the most ancient coal deposit that the most extraordinary evidence has been supplied in proof of the former existence of a very different climate—a climate which seems to have been moist, warm and extremely uniform in those very latitudes which are now the colder and in regard to temperature, the most variable regions of the globe;" page 115, Mr. Lyell further said: "I may observe that the coal fields must originally have been low alluvial grounds." It is evident from these utterances that the current of thought will in the future be directed to solving the mystery of these changed conditions. This Record asserts that

organic vegetable life existed on this planet before the sun or the stars occupied their present position in the heavens. Elaborate calculations have been made to determine the relative antiquity of the Earth and the Sun. Geologists claim that not less than one hundred millions of years is sufficient to account for the work which has been done in laying down the sedimentary rocks, but generally they claim a much longer period.

In Dr. James Croll's interesting book on "Climate and Time," he finds that the mean rate of denudation is one foot in six thousand years. On page 363 he says, "Taking the proportion of land to that of water at 567 to 1390, then one foot taken off the land and spread over the sea-bottom would form a layer five inches thick. Consequently, if one foot in six thousand years represents the mean rate at which land is being denuded, one foot in 14,400 years represents the mean rate at which the sedimentary rocks are being formed. Assuming, as before, that 72,000 feet would represent the mean thickness of all the sedimentary rocks which have ever been formed, this at the rate of one foot in 14,400 years, gives 1,036,800,000 years as the age of the stratified rocks." On page 355 he says, "The facts of geology, more especially those in connexion with denudation, seem to geologists to require a period of much longer duration than one hundred millions of years, and it is this, which has so long prevented them accepting the conclusions of physical science in regard to the age of our globe." On page 344 he says, "For it is evident that the geological history of our globe must be limited by the age of the sun's heat, no matter how long or short its age may be." On page 348, he says, "Suppose, with Helmholtz, that the sun originally existed as a nebulous mass, filling the entire space presently occupied by the solar system and extending into space indefinitely beyond the outermost planet." He finds that the condensation of this mass to an orb of the sun's present size would suffice to furnish heat for nearly 20,287,500 years; and on page 349, the author says, "Even supposing we limit the

geological history of our globe to one hundred millions of years, it is nevertheless evident that gravitation will not account for the supply of the sun's heat during so long a period."

Finding such an immense gap between the lowest estimate of geological time and time as measured by the sun's heat, (nearly eighty millions of years) Dr. Croll assumes that the nebulous mass of the sun may have previous to condensation had a high original temperature amounting to 49,850,000 years' heat, and concludes on page 351 with this statement, "The total amount of heat given out by the sun resulting from the condensation of his mass, on the supposition that the density of the sun is uniform throughout, we have seen to be equal to 20,237,500 years' sun heat. Then the quantity of heat given out, which previously existed in the mass as original temperature, must have been 49,850,000 years' heat, making in all 70,087,500 years' heat as the total amount." Even this latter calculation leaves between the lowest estimate of geological time and that of time as measured by the sun's heat nearly THIRTY MILLIONS OF YEARS! If these calculations of a limit to the sun's heat rested on no other authority than that of Dr. Croll, we might hesitate about their accuracy, but they are understood to be a mere repetition of calculations emanating from that distinguished physical scientist, Sir William Thompson, Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow and F. R. S. Dr. Croll having started out with the untenable assumption that the geological history of our globe must necessarily be co-ordinated with the age of the sun's heat rendered his own argument unreliable by an attempt to reconcile the wide difference between geological time and time as measured by the age of the sun's heat. It does not appear to have occurred to Dr. Croll that Moses had in this narrative furnished an easy solution of the disparity. Here again science corroborates the later age of the sun as stated in the narrative.

"And God said: Let the waters bring forth abundantly, the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

"And God created It, the great sea-monsters and every living creature that moveth (or the one creeping) which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind. And God saw that it was good. And God blessed them saying: Be fruitful and multiply in the earth. And was evening and was morning day FIFTH."

As there is not anything in the narrative which limits the creative operations of the FIFTH day to that particular period, it is more than probable in view of the light which geology sheds on this subject that the order of creation described in this part of the narrative continued throughout the residue of the six creative days. It may be further observed that the six creative days mentioned in this narrative do not appear to be abridged or modified by the constitution of the luminaries mentioned in the fourth period. Even after the fourth cosmogonic day the ages roll on until the close of the sixth period as they did from the beginning. The great cosmogonic work, was not reacted upon by its own creations so as to be turned aside from the formed design which ran through the whole from the beginning. A final purpose pervaded every atom and every world prearranged and predetermined by the Divine mind from all eternity and all these mighty worlds brought into existence and set in motion had no more power to break in upon the law of this fixed design than if they were the smallest atoms dancing in the sun-beam,

"And God said: Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind. And it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind and cattle after their kind and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind. And God saw that it was good.

"And God said: Let US make MAN in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

"So God created It, the man, in his own image; in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them.

"And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good. And was evening and was morning day the SIXTH."

Ch. 2. Thus the heavens and the earth were finished and all the host of them. And on the *seventh day* God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

The concluding part of this narrative "thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" shows that one portion of the narrative relates to the cosmical and universal and the other portion to the planet we inhabit; and on inspecting the contents of the record it is reasonably plain that the first eight verses relate to the cosmical and universal constitution of the world and the remainder of the narrative to the globe we inhabit, except as to the constitution of the luminaries on the fourth day.

This document is to be judged of not only by what it contains, but also by what it omits. A palpable mistake in the statement of any one of the numerous facts narrated would have impaired confidence in the whole, and the introduction of irrelevant matter in the details, unworthy of the dignity of the Deity would readily have betrayed its fictitious character.

The AUTHOR has performed the difficult task of framing for the Divine architect, a soliloquy suitable to the Creator, and in strict harmony with the universal Fatherhood and love of God, and at the same time has portrayed with marvelous precision the MYSTERY of Creation, from primeval nothingness, to a finished world, where to the eye, and to the telescope, the serene and quiet grandeur of the starry worlds proclaim a completed edifice, perfect in all its appointments—a moving and awe-inspiring spectacle of surprising vastness and overpowering magnificence. If we adopt the principle of the theory of

Laplace which he applied to a single member of the star sphere our own sun, and conceive of its application to a universal sphere of primeval world dust called into being by the Creator, and assume that contraction, light and rotation did take place; the planets lying on the outskirts of this immense revolving mass, would first be formed and the suns afterwards be expelled by the intensity of its contraction and heat, and a single rotation of such a sphere would properly be denominated a DAY of that sphere. With this single suggestion I leave to astronomers the task of finding in this photograph of creative processes some hint which will lead to a more fundamental and comprehensive scheme of the system of the Universe than was embraced in the theory of Laplace.

Partly corroborated by scientific evidence and partly sustained by the *weight* of such evidence this Ancient Oracle, in the full blaze of the light and intelligence of the nineteenth century shines with undiminished lustre. Reason and Faith, now, as they never did, in any former age, with convergent and conjoined strength confess its enduring truth. Even the most startling and least trusted statement in the narrative that the heat of the sun is not the full measure of organic vegetable life, has from an unexpected quarter received corroborative evidence. Geology calculating from the rate of denudation and the time required to lay down the sedimentary rocks, claims to have demonstrated on a scientific basis the very great antiquity of organic life on this globe, not less than one hundred millions of years. Physical science taking into consideration the rate at which the sun is parting with heat limits the past period of the sun's heat to less than seventy-one millions of years. These apparently conflicting results both resting on a scientific basis can only be reconciled, as we are led to infer, by accepting the statement in this narrative on that subject as true.

III.

THE SONG OF THE SWAN.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D.

THE recent discovery of a copy of Hochreutner's "Schwanengesang" has called renewed attention to the circumstances of its publication. Its author was a young Swiss minister who had heeded the call of the destitute Reformed churches of Pennsylvania, and had come to America, in 1748, under the auspices of the Synods of Holland. In his "Journal," Schlatter tells us with what joyful gratitude towards God "Hochreutner † and his companion Bartholomæus were received by the waiting churches. The latter almost immediately received and accepted a call from Tulpehocken. Hochreutner accompanied Schlatter to Lancaster, where he preached twice "to the great delight of

* *Schwanen Gesang oder Letzte Arbeit, des weiland Ehrwürdigen und Hochgelehrten Herrn Johann Jacob Hochreutner, bestimmter Prediger der Ehrsamten Reformirten Gemeinde zu Lancäster, welcher auf eine ausserordentliche Weise nach Gottes allweiser Zulassung durch einen Büchsen-Schuss aus dem Zeitlichen in das ewige Leben den 14. October 1748, im 27. Jahre seines Alters hingerücket wurde. Zum Trost der betrübten Gemeinde in Lancäster zu dem Druck befördert und mit einer Zuschrift versehen von Michael Slatter, V.D.M. zu St. Gallen in der Schweiz, gegenwärtig Reform. Prediger in Philadelphia und Germantown in Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, gedruckt bey Johann Boehm, wohnhaft in der Arch Strasse, 1748.—4to. p.p. (4) 15.*

† In his "Journal" Schlatter writes the name "Hochreutiner," and this orthography has been generally adopted by recent writers. The latter form is perhaps preferable, as the Hochreutiners of St. Gall were prominent printers in the eighteenth century. Surnames were, however, in those days, treated with great freedom, and even Schlatter, as will be observed, allowed himself considerable liberty in spelling his name.

the congregation." On the same journey he preached with great acceptance at Tulpehocken, Oley, Swamp, and Providence (Trappe). A call was extended to him by the congregation in Lancaster, but on the morning when he was prepared to depart for his field of labor he was accidentally killed in the distressing manner which is minutely related in the introduction to the "Schwanengesang." Schlatter says*: "His written sermon, which he had intended to preach as his introductory in Lancaster, and which was found in his pocket, I had printed agreeably to the earnest solicitations of many, and it has been sent to the Reverend Christian Synods, and also to others."

The title "Schwanengesang," which was prefixed to the printed discourse, may appear somewhat fanciful, but it was in accordance with the taste of the time. The myth of the swan "which e'en in singing dies," was still popularly believed, and its application in the present instance was no doubt regarded as entirely appropriate.

In the "Lives of the Fathers of the Reformed Church," vol 2, p. 18, Dr. Harbaugh says concerning this discourse: "Though we have diligently searched and inquired we have not been able to obtain a copy. Alas! has time buried this interesting relic? and has this, perhaps the only fruit of his mind and heart which seemed to receive permanent form, met the doom of his own mortal remains, Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust?"

In his "Life of Michael Schlatter," p. 186, the same author inquires: "Who will discover and bring to light this interesting relic?" For several years the writer has been aware of the existence of a single copy of the "Schwanengesang." It is carefully preserved in the Ridgway Branch of the Philadelphia Library; but as the authorities of the library very properly decline to permit rare books to be taken away, it was hitherto regarded as impracticable to secure a copy for republication. This difficulty has now been removed through the kindness of Mr. Henry S. Dotterer, of Philadelphia, to whom the writer is

* Schlatter's "Journal," Harbaugh's translation, p. 186.

indebted for a literal manuscript copy of the original. It required many visits to the library, and much clerical labor to prepare this copy, which, it need hardly be said, will be carefully preserved among the historical treasures of the Reformed Church.

In the translation and publication of this ancient discourse the writer has an object beyond the gratification of antiquarian curiosity. Though simple and practical it is thoroughly scriptural; and though antiquated in form, it contains suggestions which have lost none of their original importance. A few notes have been added by the translator.

The sermon is introduced by a dedication, written by the Rev. Michael Schlatter :

THE DEDICATION.

To the venerable Reformed congregation of Lancaster.

Afflicted Brethren and Fellow Members of the Church!

"Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?" Thus exclaims the prophet Amos, in the third chapter and sixth verse of the book of his prophecies. Forasmuch, then, as nothing can happen without the will or permission of our God, so that, as our Saviour Himself says (Luke *xxi.* 18), without the will of our Heavenly Father "not a hair of our head shall perish," ye should patiently submit to the loss of your pastor who is now most certainly happy in Heaven; and laying your hand upon your mouth, should say, "The Lord hath thus ordained it for him and for us." Especially should ye beware of becoming impatient and of murmuring against the incomprehensible Providence of God; for we read in the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, and the ninth verse: "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What doest thou?"

Our affliction was certainly purely accidental, as was after mature consideration declared under oath by twelve men, according to the custom of the country, and afterwards confirmed by the impartial judgment of many other prominent persons. Mr. Hochreutner was ready to start on his journey to Lancaster at the very hour in which he lost his life; he had drawn on his boots; had put the following and several other sermons, together with the Liturgy, etc., into his pocket; and was waiting for the companion who was to accompany him, but who to his great horror found him lying dead. He had considerably proposed to unload his gun, so that no other person might be injured by it; thus himself falling into the danger from which he sought

to save others, and sacrificing his precious life in a moment, after he had spent nine weeks in my dwelling.*

In all this it becomes us to admire the wonderful plans and purposes of God. If you had already experienced for him universal affection and sincere confidence, and had hoped that he might accomplish much good in your midst by his doctrine and life, let me pray you to consider: Who in the wicked and perverted primeval world was more necessary than Enoch?

*In Saur's Germantown paper of Nov. 6, 1748 there is an editorial article on the death of Hochreutner which is so characteristic that we cannot refrain from translating and quoting it. Saur, as is well known, was a member of one of the German "peace sects" and cordially disliked "the churches." To him the Reformed ministry was, at best, a life of vanity, and the mere possession of a weapon of warfare was an abomination. These facts may indicate the motive of the miserable cant and the shameless illustration which he saw fit to employ in the following article:

"John Jacob Hochreuter, Studios. Theol., born at St. Gall, in Switzerland, was sent to Pennsylvania as a Reformed minister, arrived this fall in Philadelphia, and was recently appointed preacher at Lancaster. When he was told that he would find there a congregation of rough, impertinent and unpolished people, he replied: 'In that case I would rather be a wood-chopper.' His congregation had sent him a horse to Philadelphia, and he had intended to travel to Lancaster in company with the mail-carrier; but at the appointed hour he was found lying dead in his room, booted and spurred, with a gun at his side. A shot had passed through his left breast, and the bullet was found flattened out behind the shoulder-blade, just under the skin. There is no indication that the shooting was intentional. The ramrod was not quite at its proper place, and it is therefore supposed that he had either attempted to draw it out or to put it in. With him was found a written sermon which he had intended to preach two days later; its theme is: "The Divine Call of Young Samuel." 1 Samuel, 3. We hear that he had good natural talents, and withal a certain measure of the fear of God and a good beginning in Christian experience. Those who judge charitably believe that he seriously proposed to serve the Lord; but that God saw that he was in danger of being drawn back to the vanities of the world, and therefore called him to eternity.

It is related that as a certain servant was travelling with his master he saw a fox creeping into a hole. To please his master he ran and caught the fox, but the animal turned round, bit his hand and held him fast. His master called, "Have you got him?" but the servant replied, "Sir, he has got me!" So it has happened to many a well-meaning person who was caught and held by vanity because the Lord did not send him. Alas! they do not know that they have been caught and firmly fettered, and do not desire to be made free. Certainly, a weapon of murder is not a proper instrument for a preacher, much less for a believer; for the weapons of their warfare are not fleshly, much less murderous; but when we consider how our young people are ruined by sending them to high-schools, such things are not surprising, except a man be born again.

Whoever abstains from criticism and judgment, minds his own affairs, and commits everything to God, will certainly travel by the safest way."

Nevertheless, it is said of him that "he walked with God, and he was not, for God took him. (Genesis v. 24.) Therefore, concede cheerfully unto your departed pastor his everlasting rest.

In the thirty-fifth chapter of the book of Numbers we read that the Lord God appointed six cities of refuge for involuntary homicides. Dear Friends, I do not doubt that our deceased brother, who was so unexpectedly compelled to taste of death, has most certainly found a city of refuge in the wounds of Jesus; and that he will forever remain with this eternal High-priest, who never dies, and whose vicarious sacrifice was in his lifetime his comfort and consolation.

We read concerning Samson (Judges xvi. 30) that more persons were slain at his death than in his life. Ah! Would to God that many—yes! all of you—would die unto sin and the world, and so take this melancholy occasion to heart that in the certain conviction that we are not assured of our life for a single hour, you should become sincerely converted unto God; then would his death have accomplished more good than he probably could have wrought in the course of a long life. It is certain that if he had died in his bed in the usual way, the event would have attracted little or no attention. As it is, we do not know what the Lord proposes to accomplish by such examples; but, in my opinion, it can be nothing else than to warn mankind and to lead them tenderly to repentance.

Take into consideration the following events:

On the 22d of September, the Very Reverend Provost Sandin—an Evangelical minister who arrived from Sweden last summer—fell asleep in the Lord, after an illness of several days.*

On the 14th of October, the author of this sermon was smitten; and

On the 8th of November—that is, yesterday—the Reverend and well-beloved Mr. Tranenberg, Evangelical Swedish pastor at Wilmington, departed unto a blessed eternity.†

What the God of Justice may desire to teach us by this three-fold cleft in our Protestant Church is worthy of profound reflection. Certainly, we

* Rev. John Sandin was, in January, 1747, appointed by the Swedish Royal Commission, Pastor of the parishes of Raccoon and Pennsneck, New Jersey. To prevent irregularities he was also directed to act as superintendent of all the Swedish churches in that part of America, with the title of Provost and an annual salary of £50. Acrelius says ("History of New Sweden," p. 338): "In August, 1748, he fell asleep in the Lord, leaving his wife in a foreign land with a new-born babe." No doubt the date of his death is more correctly given by Schlatter.

† Rev. Peter Tranberg, or Tranenberg, was for 22 years a Swedish pastor in America. He was taken with fatal illness while attending to a funeral in New Jersey. Acrelius, p. 299.

should worship the omnipotence of God, and exclaim, "The Lord of Hosts hath purposed and who shall disannul it? and His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" (Isaiah xiv. 27.) But, on the other hand, we should not forget the word of the Lord, spoken by the same prophet: "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come. He shall enter into peace; they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness" (Isaiah lvii. 1-2).

Therefore, beloved brethren, suffer all these things to be subservient to your salvation. Accept the following sermon as a testament or legacy from your pastor, and permit him thus to call aloud in your heart, all the days of your life: "Serve the Lord your God; fear Him, and be obedient unto Him!" If you heed these words, the message will suffice for time and eternity. Amen.

With all my heart I wish you this blessing; "and now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified" (Acts xx. 32).

I remain, as ever,

Your obedient servant and friend, in Grace,

MICHAEL SLATTER, V. D. M.

Philadelphia, November 9, 1748.

THE DISCOURSE.

THE EFFECTUAL CALLING OF THE YOUTHFUL PROPHET SAMUEL.

A Sermon which the Author proposed to preach in Lancaster on the 16th of October.

TEXTUS: 1 Samuel iii. 1-11.

1. And the child Samuel ministered to the Lord before Eli. And the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no open vision.

2. And it came to pass at that time when Eli was laid down in his place, and his eyes began to wax dim, that he could not see;

3. And ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was, and Samuel was laid down to sleep;

4. That the Lord called Samuel: and he answered, Here am I.

5. And he ran unto Eli and said, Here am I; for thou calledst me. And he said, I called not; lie down again. And he went and lay down.

6. And the Lord called, yet again, Samuel. And Samuel arose and went to Eli and said, Here am I, for thou didst call me. And he answered, I called not, my son; lie down again.

7. Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him.

8. And the Lord called Samuel again the third time. And he arose and

went to Eli, and said, Here am I, for thou didst call me. And Eli perceived that the Lord had called the child.

9. Therefore Eli said unto Samuel, Go, lie down; and it shall be if he call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth. So Samuel went and lay down in his place.

10. And the Lord came, and stood, and called as at other times, Samuel, Samuel. Then Samuel answered, Speak; for thy servant heareth.

11. And the Lord said Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle."

"Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into his harvest." (Matthew ix. 38.)

With these words our Lord Jesus Christ represents to His apostles and disciples the necessity of the ministerial office; and He does this under the image of a harvest in which there are but few laborers though many are needed. The children of Israel, it is true, were well provided with laborers, or prophets; but they lacked faithful pastors, wherefore they were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. (Isaiah liii. 6, and Matthew ix. 36.)

If the harvest was great in the days of the apostles, when the Christian Church was only beginning to grow and blossom, how much greater must it now appear, when it is planted, full grown, and ripe for the sickle. Surely, it has become so widely extended that we may say concerning it, in the language of the nineteenth Psalm, "Its line is gone out through all the earth and its words to the end of the world." Have we not reason, therefore, to pray earnestly unto the Lord that He would send faithful teachers and preachers to toil cheerfully and joyously in His harvest—to labor faithfully in the vineyard of the Lord?

It may appear strange, my dear hearers, that I should venture to accept this difficult and important vocation and appear in this holy place, though I am but the meanest in Manasseh, a great sinner, and the least and weakest among my brethren in the house of God; but I would have you to unite with me in believing that this has not happened by chance, and that it has pleased the Lord of the Harvest, in accordance with

his wise and righteous purposes, to call me hither from distant lands. You are aware that I was chosen and sent to this country by the most reverend Deputies of the Synods of North and South Holland, and that subsequently, at your request, our very reverend brother, Pastor Slatter, appointed me your regular pastor.

I might have sufficient reason to complain of the importance and difficulty of my office and of my own unworthiness; I might be afraid of the almost insupportable load that is to be laid upon my weak shoulders; I might even express a wish to retire from the toil, care and trouble which are before me, inasmuch as I might, like Moses, plead my imperfect utterance; like Isaiah, my sinfulness; and like Jeremiah, my youth; yet would I rather, like Samuel in our text, give heed to the voice of God, submit to it obediently, and constantly, with a reverend and humble heart, admire the wise and gracious Providence of the Lord.

PRAYER.

O Lord, my God! Behold here am I! Thou hast called me hither; I am ready, and will gladly go whither thou sendest me; and whatsoever Thou commandest me that will I speak. "Speak, Lord; for Thy servant heareth." If I have a stammering tongue put words into my mouth, as Thou didst unto Thy prophet Jeremiah. Give unto me a learned yet simple tongue, that, like Isaiah, I may know to speak a word in season to him that is weary. If I have unclean lips—so that I must needs cry out: "Woe is me, because I am a man of unclean lips, and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips"—touch them, I pray Thee, and sanctify them by Thy Holy Spirit. If I am young, make me old in wisdom, so that as I grow older I may increase in favor with God and man. If I am weak—oh! let Thy strength be made perfect in my weakness. Direct me by Thy power from on high, so that I boldly cry aloud and spare not; that I may lift up my voice like a trumpet, and show Thy people their transgression and the house of Jacob their

sins; and where and whenever I preach may I be instant in season and out of season, reproving, rebuking, exhorting, with all long-suffering and doctrine. To this end pour out Thy divine and Holy Spirit, as on the Day of Pentecost that we may even now declare the wonderful works of God; that I may serve Thee, O God! like Aaron, and magnify my office as becomes the glory of Thy name; that I may be bold, like Elias; and seek to build up Thy church, like Peter; that, like Paul, I may confirm my holy doctrine by a godly life. Pour forth Thy Holy Spirit also upon the hearts of all my hearers; open their hearts as Thou didst unto Lydia, that they may not, like Martha, be careful and troubled about many things, but may rather, like Mary, choose the good part, and sit at the feet of Jesus to listen to His blessed word. May they search the Scriptures like "those of Berea," and, like David, speak of them day and night, so that, by this rule, peace and mercy may follow us all the days of our life. And now, O Thou triune God! I will, at Thy command, plant Thy vineyard like Paul, and water it like Apollos, if Thou, according to Thy unending love, wilt but grant unto it growth and increase. To this end bless the beginning, prosper the continuance, and sanctify the conclusion of my office, to the honor of Thy name, the extension of Thy kingdom, and the salvation of our souls. Amen.

My dear hearers! In assuming my office I propose, if it be God's will, to preach several sermons in illustration of the following theme:

THE EFFECTUAL CALLING OF THE YOUTHFUL PROPHET SAMUEL, which he himself has described in the words of our text. Let us consider its entire history in three separate parts:

I. The Occasion: Why Samuel was called.

II. The Season: When he was called.

III. The Nature of the Call.

The occasion of the calling of Samuel is related in the passage beginning with the twelfth verse of the second chapter and continuing to the conclusion of our text. There we have the

story of the neglected household training of the high-priest Eli, and of the wickedness of his two sons, Hophni and Phinehas. Of the latter it is said that they were sons of Belial; they knew not the Lord and cared not for the priest's custom with the people; they were thieves who stole what was sacrificed to the Lord, and what was not voluntarily given unto them they took by force; wherefore it came to pass that men abhorred the offering of the Lord. To robbery and sacrilege they added other crimes and indecencies, so that they became by their wickedness an abomination in the sight of God. Their father Eli had been guilty of gross neglect, for he had allowed them to do as they pleased, though he was aware of their scandalous conduct, and had not only failed to punish them but had closed his eyes to their wickedness. On this account the wrath of God was kindled against him, and the Lord announced unto him, through His prophet Samuel, that He would cut off his whole house, and that he himself should die a violent death. All this was subsequently fulfilled by the death, in a single day, of the aforesaid two wicked sons, a daughter-in-law, and the high-priest Eli himself, who fell backward from his seat and was killed, thus destroying his whole family, according to the word of the Lord, which had not only foretold his death and that of his children, but that Samuel should be put in his place; for He said: "I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind: and I will build him a sure house; and he shall walk before mine Anointed for ever." This Samuel was soon afterward called by the Lord our God, and to him He revealed what He had determined concerning Eli and his two sons, and with what judgment and punishment He would visit them.

From all this we may observe with what sternness the Lord punishes ministers who do not faithfully fulfill the duties of the office to which He has been pleased to ordain them.

We observe, secondly, that the misfortune of one is frequently the good fortune of another. We have an example of this in Samuel, who was called to take the place of Eli because

the latter and his sons had sinned against the Lord. Thus it has happened in every age of the world's history. When Saul became disobedient to the Lord, David was anointed king (1 Sam. xvi. 13); when Pharaoh hardened his heart, the children of Israel were delivered from Egypt (Exodus v. 2); when the priests of Baal attempted to deceive, Daniel's life was preserved ("Bel and the Dragon," 24); when the Jews had fallen away from the Lord, the Gentiles were admitted to the covenant of grace. Thus the Lord transforms deadly poison into medicine, curses into blessings, punishment into mercy, and, in brief, causes all things to be conducive to our eternal welfare.

In the second place the season of the call is described: 1. In general; 2. In particular.

1. *In general.* Samuel was called at a time when "the word of the Lord was precious and there was no open vision," as is related from the first to the fifth chapter, in which we are told:

A. How he lived. B. At what period he lived.

A. His life illustrates his name, Samuel, which signifies "asked of God." It was a beautiful name, as suitable to his person as to his position and office; for thus his mother Hannah had named him, because she had asked him of the Lord when she and her husband Elkanah went up to Shiloh and there prayed unto the Lord that He would look upon the affliction of His handmaid and give her a man child. And when the Lord had heard her and she had borne a son she called his name Samuel, saying, "Because I have asked him of the Lord" (chap. i., v. 20). From this we may incidentally learn, while we recognize the beauty of a name which so completely expresses the person and character of the prophet, how important it is that we who are called CHRISTIANS and REFORMED should perform such deeds and works as will harmonize with the beautiful names which we bear.

In the Old Testament it was very usual that children, either by the direct commandment of God or for some other reason, received names which were expressive of their personal characteristics. Thus, God called the first man Adam, because he

was made out of the ground, and the woman Eve, because she was the mother of all the living; Abraham, a father of all believers; Moses, a water-child; Job, a sufferer; David, a beloved one; Peter, a rock; Jesus, a Saviour, etc., so that in these instances we may well say in language like that of Solomon: "A good name is more precious than riches and better than silver and gold" (Proverbs xxii. 1).

B. With respect to his age, Samuel was a boy when he was called by the Lord; a young boy of twelve years; whence we may conclude that he was still of small stature and was accounted a child. By this the Lord God desired to show that when He calls a human being to His service He binds Himself to no particular age; He chooses a Samuel in his boyhood as freely as a Peter and an Andrew in their manhood; a youthful Jeremiah as readily as a mature Zaccheus; a John in his minority as well as an eloquent Gamaliel in the fullness of his strength; for "with him is no respect of persons" (Ephes. vi. 9), and Peter says: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him" (Acts x. 34-35). Thus God calls whomsoever He wills, for He is not only the God of the Jews but of the Gentiles; not only the God of Abraham but of his seed. "For the promise is unto you and to your children" we read in the second chapter of the Acts and the thirty-ninth verse. Children, as well as adults, have a share in the kingdom of God, and must therefore be partakers of the divine call; therefore, also, our Lord Jesus Christ thanks His heavenly Father that He hath hid these things from the wise and prudent and has revealed them unto babes; for out of the mouths of babes and sucklings He has ordained strength (Psalms viii. 3).

C.—The office of Samuel is described in the words, "And the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli." Was not this a glorious service for one so young? We are apt to excuse the young by saying, "Youth is youth; from it you cannot expect substantial service or attention;" but in Samuel,

my hearers, youth was manly, so that it might well be said that youth and truth had met together, and that this boy revealed two cardinal virtues, to wit: the fear of God and obedience. He feared God, for the text says, "He ministered unto the Lord." Before Samuel was born his mother, as we have already seen, had vowed a vow unto the Lord that if He would give her a man child she would dedicate him to the service of the Lord, as a sacrifice of thanksgiving. Faithfully she kept her promise, for as soon as her child was weaned she brought him to Eli, the priest, that he might appear before the Lord and there abide forever. In the service to which Samuel was devoted, he was earnest and faithful, performing his duties with pleasure, so that it is said of him that he spent his days and nights in the courts of the tabernacle. . . . His highest purpose was to serve God with an honest heart and to prove himself His faithful servant. ;

Teachers and preachers should follow this example, if they would deserve the name of Servants of God. The work of an evangelical minister demands that he should honestly and faithfully perform the duties of his office; he must be careful to prove himself an honest and worthy laborer in the sight of God and men, and never grow weary of the work to which he has been called, so that he may finish his course with rejoicing and receive the reward which is the crown of his labor; for it is written: "Cursed is he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully," (Jerem. xlviii. 10); and again, "Blessed is that servant whom the Lord when he cometh shall find so doing," (Luke xii. 43).

Not preachers and teachers alone but all Christians should serve the Lord in the station and office where the Lord has placed them. For example, as Samuel faithfully performed his duties, so others have done. Thus, Jacob could boast that he had served Laban long and faithfully (Genesis xxv. 26); Joseph was loved and praised for his faithfulness throughout the land of Egypt (Genesis xli.); Moses was found faithful (Hebrews iii. 5). Not to speak of other examples, David, Joash, Jotham,

Uzziah, Hezekiah and Josiah had the testimony that they pleased God ; wherefore the blessed apostle Paul admonishes us, that if any one has the ministry he should wait on his ministering (Rom. xii. 7), and Peter says (1 Peter iv. 11), "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God ; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth ; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion forever and ever, Amen."

These examples should induce every one of us to serve the Lord, not only in a particular station, but by Christian conduct, to the end of his life. Finally we may see how beautiful it is to behold the young devoting their early years to the service of their blessed Lord.

Samuel ministered unto the Lord when he was twelve years old ; so Moses was called "a fair child" before God (Acts vii. 20), and Job had the assurance that "in the days of his youth the secret of God was upon his tabernacle," (Job xxix. 4). David was convinced that God had taught him from his youth, according to Psalm lxx. 5. Solomon gives excellent counsel to all when he says (Ecclesiastes xii. 1), "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth ;" and Paul exhorts Timothy to "flee youthful lusts," and to "follow after righteousness ;" for the service of children and youth is acceptable to the Lord, inasmuch as He is not satisfied with the service of old age, but demands the first fruits of our lives.

Samuel was also obedient to the Lord, for the text says : "He ministered unto the Lord before Eli." One virtue succeeds the other ; at first he exercised himself in the fear of God and afterwards in obedience ; and, indeed these two virtues are generally associated. Samuel was devout towards God and obedient to his master, the high-priest, Eli, to whom his mother had committed him that he might be taught the service of God. Even though Eli failed to do his full duty, Samuel performed his part, and was obedient, willing and true in his service. He gladly received instruction and accepted admonition with reverence, serving under Eli—or as it is more properly rendered,

"before his countenance"—not as though he had only performed eye-service, and had done whatever he pleased in the absence of his master, but rather doing his best at all times, as though his master had been constantly present.

From this we may learn how, in every station, we should serve those who are placed in authority over us; that children should obey their parents, subjects the government, servants their masters and mistresses; for of those who would serve well, piety, obedience and cheerful service are demanded. Unto children it is said, "Obey your parents in the Lord for this is right. Honor thy father and thy mother (which is the first commandment with promise), that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth" (Ephes. vi. 1-3). Congregations are exhorted, "Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you" (Hebrews xiii. 17).

Servants are admonished, "Be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart" (Ephes. vi. 5-6). We are all exhorted to "serve one another by love" (Gal. v. 13), and St. Paul sums up the whole matter by telling us to be "faithful in all things" (1 Tim. iii. 11).

APPLICATION.

In the biography of Samuel, my dear hearers, we have a charming picture of a boy called to be a prophet, a manly child, an obedient youth, a faithful minister, a devout servant of his Lord and Master.

If we should attempt to write the biography of modern Christians how small a number of Samuels would appear! In many instances—I will not say in the majority, though the assertion might be true—instead of virtue we should find corruption and shame.

O, how few children there are who deserve to be called Samuel because they are asked of the Lord! Children there are—children of Belial—begotten in heathenish lust and shame; is it surprising that many of them, though they have received beautiful Christian names, live a worthless and godless life? How many who are called John, which means “full of grace,” ought rather to be called “graceless.” Simon means “obedient”—should it not frequently be changed to “disobedient?” Peter should be *firm*, as his name indicates, but he is often *inconstant*. Solomon “the man of peace,” is frequently the man of dissension; David, “the loving one,” is too often destitute of affection. Is it surprising, then, that many who are called *Christian* live an *unchristian* life; that many who call themselves *Reformed* ought rather to be called *Deformed*; of whom may be said in the language of the Apocalypse, “they have the name and are not, but are the Synagogue of Satan,” (Rev. ii. 9). Here we may apply the words of St. Jerome, “Do you imagine yourself a worthy man because you bear a beautiful name?—*vel muta mores vel nomen alias pulchro tuo nomine peribis*; that is, either change your name or your morals, or you shall perish with your beautiful name.”

O, how few there are who can declare, with Samuel, that they have served the Lord from their youth! More generally they are from their youth devoted to Satan, the world, and their own sinful flesh, and are hardly willing to give their old age to their Maker. Young people are apt to imagine that they have the privilege of doing whatever delights the heart or pleases the eye; therefore they rejoice in their youth, and walk in the ways of their heart, but do not consider that for all these things God will bring them into judgment, (Ecclesiastes xi. 9). Though a pious Samuel should serve in the House of the Lord, and exhort them without ceasing, they would continue to serve the devil, their belly, and the lusts of the world.

Those who are more advanced in years insist that they must use the world because they dwell in it; that they must accommodate themselves to their surroundings if they would not be

considered misanthropical; that if they should spend their whole time reading books or listening to sermons they would become fools. Of such persons we might inquire, in the words of the prophet, "Who hath required this at your hand?" (Isaiah i. 12). In fact, however, they would rather be considered children of the world than pious Samuels; they would rather be free-thinkers than earnest Christians.

The aged pretend that they ought to be excused from attendance at church on account of their infirmities, though they may spend whole nights in seeking for ways to cheat their neighbors, or to avoid the payment of their honest debts; or, possibly they spend many hours in drinking-houses, reading or hearing the news, and slandering their neighbors. When such persons are invited to hear the preaching of the Gospel they claim to have no time on account of the multitude of their engagements; but withal nothing afflicts them so much as the knowledge that they must die and leave all their business behind them. They fancy that they make their peace with God by means of a death-bed service, offering to Him, with a dying body, the sacrifice of a miserable, sin-sick soul. Can anything better be expected of an aged sinner?

O, what a multitude of imperfections and weaknesses appear on every side! How small is the number of those who imitate Samuel in the fear of God and obedience! The fear of God is found but rarely, and is more frequently derided than defended; and as for faithfulness and obedience, they might be sought, as it were, with a lantern by daylight. In these days most Christians are Laodicean—lukewarm and cold-hearted; not earnest, faithful and zealous as Samuel was. There are preachers and pastors who lack courage to reprove sinners; or rather, they lack freedom to do this, for in this free country sinners are unwilling to hear anything from the lips of a minister that might possibly humiliate them or disturb their consciences. When a sermon is felt to have a personal application they make it an occasion to slander the preacher; and if the minister ventures to tell them the truth from the pulpit, they

regard it as a sufficient reason to refuse to sit under his preaching. There are hearers who lack reverence, docility and repentance; parents who lack earnestness, faithfulness and care, to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; masters who treat their servants unkindly; children who lack reverence, obedience, piety, industry, faithfulness, uprightness and thankfulness. In brief, there are few persons to be found who are faithful in their office and calling, as Samuel was, and many who ought to be heartily ashamed that a young boy like Samuel should have so greatly excelled them in the performance of duty. The latter can hardly expect a happier fate than that of Eli and his sons—a fate which is, as it were, be-
wailed to the present day.

My dear hearers! If you seek the blessing of the Lord, serve Him, as it is meet, in your daily avocations and Christian life.

Samuel served the Lord in the tabernacle, so should you serve Him, not only in this temple but in your houses, each one in the position or vocation where God has placed him faithfully, willingly and with an honest heart; for God is not pleased with unwilling service. "For if I do this thing willingly I have a reward" (1 Cor. ix. 17).

Samuel served God *under* Eli. My dear hearers, follow his example! Ye servants and subordinates, whatever your station may be, let each one serve under his Eli—his master or employer, his government, his teacher and pastor, his parents or superiors. Follow the admonition of the apostle Paul, where he says: "Servants, be obedient to them who are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ" (Ephes. vi. 5).

O, ye youths—sons and daughters—follow with all seriousness the footsteps of the youthful prophet Samuel, and accustom yourselves betimes to piety and the fear of God. "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them" (Eccles. xii. 1). And again, as Solomon the wise admonishes you in his Proverbs: "My son, give me

thy heart, and let thine eyes observe my ways" (xxiii. 26). "Keep sound wisdom and discretion; then shalt thou walk in thy way safely, and thy foot shall not stumble" (iii. 21, 23).

May you all prove yourselves worthy laborers of the Lord—faithful servants and handmaids of Jesus! Serve Him like Samuel, willingly, uprightly and with a loving heart! Serve Him constantly and at all seasons, in good and evil days, in riches and poverty, in health and sickness, in life and death!

Be encouraged and urged onward by the following consideration:

1. You have received a beautiful name, either by baptism or by the profession of faith. Whatever it may be, you are at least Christians in name; and ought you not, therefore, cheerfully to serve the Lord Christ? A nobler name awaits you if you do your duty, for you may become "children of God through Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 26; Rom. viii. 6, 7). An exalted name increases our obligations to Christian duty; therefore, strive to do good for your name's sake, and for the sake of Him who gave it. "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (2 Timothy iii. 19).

2. Learn to appreciate the necessity of serving God. "For God hath not called us unto uncleanness but unto holiness" (1 Thess. iv. 7). "He hath chosen us . . . that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love" (Ephes. i. 4). "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, etc." (Titus ii. 11). "Jesus Christ gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works" (Titus ii. 14).

3. It is proper that we should seek to perform this duty. What can be more proper than that we should recognize Him who "hath delivered us out of the hand of our enemies, that we may serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life" (Luke ii. 74-75). The good Lord serves us every day, yea, every hour and moment. The blessed Trinity serves us. God the Father preserves us, together with heaven,

and earth, and all creatures ; the Son of God redeems, and the Holy Ghost sanctifies and renews us. Ought we not, therefore to offer unto this triune God the reciprocal service of a humble and thankful heart.

Let us then, like Samuel, be zealous in the labors which are required of faithful servants of the Lord. Let us be industrious in reading and hearing the word of God ; and at home let every house-father be regular in the performance of Christian duties and in conducting family worship. Especially should parents imitate Hannah, the mother of Samuel, in carefully bringing up their children, as plants of righteousness, dedicated to the glory of God.

O blessed souls, who serve the Lord ! They shall lack no good thing ; they shall have aid in trial and persecution, and comfort in adversity, misfortune and pain. Blessed in time and eternity, they shall hear the consoling words : " Well done, ye good and faithful servants ; ye have been faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler over many things ; enter ye into the joy of your Lord."

Now, Lord, " teach us to do thy will, for Thou art our God ; may thy good Spirit lead us into the land of uprightness " (Psalm cxliii. 10). Lead us to Thy throne, that we may serve Thee night and day, and join in the angelic anthem : " Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts ; the whole earth is full of his glory." To the triune God be honor, praise and thanksgiving, forever and ever. Amen.

IV.

THE LABOR PROBLEM.

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM.

THIS seems to be one of the difficult problems of the ages. At present it is attracting universal attention. It is discussed in the pulpit, by the press, in the legislature, on the platform, in the trades unions, and in the labor organizations. It is, in fact, pressing with tremendous force for a solution. If mere theory could avail, it would have been settled long ago. For it has been discussed for long ages: and, judging from the present outlook, one might think it would continue to be discussed for ages to come.

The writer of this paper is no pessimist, yet the problem seems at present involved practically in midnight darkness.

The attitude of capital and labor towards one another seems to be one of irreconcilable antipathy. The conflict between these contending interests has been waged for centuries, and as we now see it carried on, it takes the appearance of an "irrepressible conflict." Instead of coming to a satisfactory understanding, the breach between the contending parties grows wider and wider. The very efforts put forth with the purpose of effecting a reconciliation end rather in inflaming, than in allaying the evil passions of the belligerents.

Possibly this apparently bad state of affairs may be the har-binger of better things, since, if we once fully comprehend our differences, we may be able more clearly to see wherein we can come to agreement. However this may be, it is difficult from the present outlook, to predict how, or in what respect, or by what means, such an agreement may be reached.

The position of the contestants is such that the ethical

relations of the conflict are kept in abeyance. With the great mass of those who are personally contending in this warfare, there seems to be no question of morality involved. The right or wrong of the thing, considered in its higher relations, seems thus to be overlooked, or ignored. Moral responsibility, if acknowledged at all, seems to be held as a sort of after consideration, as if it had no part whatever in the settlement of so momentous a question. This will become evident by considering the manner and means used in prolonging the struggle. We say *prolonging*, because the weapons of this warfare seem specially adapted for that end.

On one side there is usually a resort to lawless violence, and the destruction of property; on the other, the battle is waged in a more polished and less barbarous style, but yet with equal malignity and cruelty. Secular interest, and that only, enters into the conflict, and no concern is felt beyond the mere questions of money and license. Each is determined to gain the day. Capital is determined to maintain its ascendancy and control. Labor is equally determined to wrest this ascendancy and control, and to exercise the monopoly that has always been enjoyed by the other side. It is not meant here that all laboring men are contending for such high-handed tyranny. On the contrary, a very small minority of them are fighting for such a wild and impossible dream. But this minority is allowed at this time to represent the interest of labor, and it carries on the struggle in its own way; and that way indicates that they have, for the time being at least, suppressed their sense of moral obligation.

The conflict has assumed such proportions that all classes of society are affected by it in a greater or less degree, not only in a material point of view, which would be deplorable enough, on account of its impoverishing effects, but also in such way as to endanger the peace of communities, and to threaten the overthrow of the social organism, which can only result finally in the downfall of the State, and leave us in a state of anarchy.

To add to this deplorable state of affairs, portions of the laboring classes are turning their batteries against each other. The war against the Chinese and the Hungarians sufficiently proves this; as well as the attempts of the Knights of Labor to force all other working-men into their own bad measures.

If now the rich capitalists and the Knights of Labor were the only ones to suffer, or if they could be left to fight it out to their hearts' content without involving others in the consequences, we might be content to let them go ahead and reap the bitter fruits of their folly. But one of the chief miseries of the case is, that others, not directly interested, are led by inclination, or some *supposed interest*, or by intimidation, to give comfort and assistance to one or the other party.

Or, if the "powers that be," could or would exert the strong arm of the law, the evil might in some sense be abated. But it would be difficult, if not impossible, for government to settle the matter impartially, because while one party openly violates the law, the other adroitly evades it. The one exhibits the brutality of the bear, the other, the cunning of the fox. This gives the advantage generally to the side of the rich. For the same cunning and prudence that have won for them their present power will serve them a good purpose in holding it. And while the poor laborer becomes amenable to the law for his violence, the other escapes it by outwardly conforming to its letter, while he violates its spirit.

And then, again, repression and coercion, unaccompanied by a moral influence, have always failed in the end, to ameliorate the condition of men. The history of Russia since the reign of Nihilism is a case in point. The experience of France in its troubles with Communism, and that of England in its attempts to control Ireland by force, both evince the utter futility of reforming abuses by the mere execution of law. The scheme of Gladstone for the pacification of Ireland is the first attempt at anything like the employment of moral force, and though it may for the present not entirely succeed, yet it is plain that he has inaugurated a policy far superior to that of

any of his predecessors. And unless English greed continues to exert its influence, this policy will ultimately prevail, and Ireland will be free to work out its own problem under the fostering care, but without the fear of the power of England.

As the problem now appears, society, for the sake of the discussion may be viewed in a threefold aspect—1. Capitalists, 2. Laborers. 3. An intermediate class, including all other people.

Between the first two classes, a seemingly irreconcilable antagonism has come into existence, growing out of what they are pleased to regard as a conflict of interests. These interests are purely material. Whatever is a gain to the one is regarded as a loss to the other. Each seems to think that he is entitled to all the gain, no matter what becomes of the other. Thus leaving out of view every principle of moral rectitude, and closing their eyes to the mutual helpfulness which might, and ought to, result from their relations as employer and employed, they bitterly and angrily contend for the so-called rights, which, in reality do not, and ought not to exist. In fact their interests are one. And if the selfishness of the contestants could be eliminated, or reduced to its true ethical ground, it would be easy for both to see how a mutual helpfulness, and a mutual regard for *right*, would advance the true interests of all. The principle here contended for is this: If I make all my efforts contribute to the welfare of the community in which I live, if I care for the happiness of my employee, or if I work honestly for the interest of my employer, then I am using the very best means of securing my own interest and happiness.

But unhappily this is just what the scramblers for the ascendancy have hitherto failed to see. Blinded by prejudice, and supreme but misguided selfishness, they bring their interests into antagonism, and so contribute largely to the defeat of their own cause. While the two parties are skirmishing in this way, the third class (the middle class of the people), might look on with careless interest or indifference.

We might say, "If our neighbors choose mutually to destroy each other, it is no concern of ours," on the principle of Cain. But if we thus had no concern for our fellow beings, still we could not be entirely disinterested spectators of the desolating effects of this senseless conflict on society at large, and on ourselves as individual members of it. Our social nature makes it impossible to isolate ourselves so as to have no share in the material prosperity or adversity of our fellow-men. As mind must act upon mind, and moral sense upon moral sense, in order to mutual growth in the higher relations of life, so our material and secular interests depend upon those of others.

Thus the physical comforts and happiness of the masses are suspended upon the regularity and constancy with which their wants are supplied. If the coal mines cease to be operated there results a dearth of fuel; and suffering is the inevitable result. If the fires in the locomotives are extinguished and the avenues of trade closed, food must become scarce and expensive. This is especially distressing in cities and in the more thickly settled portions of the country. This indeed might be but a slight inconvenience to the wealthy, but is a sad calamity to the poor. Viewed from this material standpoint alone, it is difficult, if not impossible, to calculate the evils which such a conflict entails upon society, the great body of which is entirely innocent, so far as this warfare is concerned. In this, doubtless, as in other respects, suffering is vicarious, the innocent atoning for the guilty, "the just for the unjust." But since all do suffer in this way, whether they are responsible for this struggle or not, all must be deeply concerned for the solution of the problem.

That all men have certain "inalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," no American who believes in the Declaration of Independence can deny. The fundamental principles of the Great Republic, and the Supreme Law of the Land, guarantee to all its citizens the enjoyment of these rights. They protect every man in his legitimate endeavors to maintain them. Under no circumstances

do they offer advantages to one man, to the detriment of another. Before this Supreme Law all men are equal, the rich and the poor, the native and the naturalized citizen, the white and the black. Class legislation is entirely foreign from the grand idea underlying republican government, which is the government of the governed; and in these respects no citizen has the advantage of another.

And, yet it is true, even under such benign and just laws, that men, in the struggle for subsistence, for competence, or for wealth, are jostled and elbowed and antagonized by their fellow strugglers in the race for life. Some by perseverance, prudence, foresight, cunning, acquisitiveness and a special aptitude for retaining what they acquire, grow rich and flourish. Others less fitted for the struggle, either by nature, or lack of prudence, or mismanagement, or for reasons beyond their control, always remain poor. In consequence of the unequal rivalry, a supercilious pride and contempt possesses the successful competitor, and a feeling of inferiority and envy inspires the other. Ostentation and domineering insolence characterize the one, and in consequence, the "green-eyed monster" haunts the other. And thus because success and failure have combined to place them in different spheres, a conflict arises. And yet they are necessary to each other. Capital and labor are complementary. One cannot exist without the other. The chimera of an equal distribution of property is simply absurd. If all had plenty of wealth, all would starve, for there would be no laborers; and a child knows that the necessities of life are but the product of endless toil. Or supposing an equal distribution possible, the equality could never be maintained. In a few years it would all be in the hands of the few again, and so a new distribution would become necessary from time to time *ad infinitum*. The idea is the mere figment of some unsettled brains.

There must be capitalists, and there must be laborers, if the world is to make any material progress, and mankind be made happy. The capitalist must buy labor and the poor man must

sell it. Capital is not available without labor; and the poor man must go hungry, and raimentless and shelterless, unless he can dispose of his labor. But alas! the rich man grinds the face of the poor to gratify his greed. He hires him at the lowest possible price, while he demands the very highest for his products.

If one refuses to labor he looks out for another, and thus he grows richer, and in so doing makes his brother poorer. But not succeeding to his taste in his individual capacity, he unites with others, forms stock companies, trades unions, pools, syndicates, in many cases, for the two-fold purpose of raising the prices of his commodities and putting down the wages of his laborers. In these questionable ways he controls both market and labor and doubly enriches himself at the expense of both consumer and laborer. Thus he disregards the rights of the laborer, insults his personality and provokes his resentment. By an exhibition of insatiate covetousness, an ambitious desire of their own pleasure, and a purpose of exercising unlimited power the rich unveil a want of regard for the personal dignity of others, and even debase their own. How humiliating is the result! The very men whose station and influence afford the means for elevating and ennobling their fellow-men, use them for a contrary purpose!

The social system involves necessarily differences and inequalities, authority and subordination. But still personality is free, and so far as this prerogative is concerned, all are alike equal, and stand on the same level. No one therefore has the right to use his fellow as a tool, or a beast of burden. In any case where the attempt is made, it betrays a want of mental force, or moral culture. The rich men who are guilty of this breach of manhood are antinomian in the worst sense of the word.

As said above it provokes resentment. The laborer, learning what he supposes to be wisdom from his superior, attempts to follow his example, with the hope of defending himself with the same weapons that have defeated him. Self-defense is an

inalienable right. It is sanctioned by the moral sense of mankind in all ages of the world, and men are prompted to it by a universal instinct, whenever they feel themselves injured or oppressed. Hence if a man kills another in self-defense, when he has no other way to save himself, however much we may deplore the necessity of the act, our verdict must ever be, "not guilty." An outward act like this involves guilt only, when it is the result of a wish or purpose. The violent wrong-doer, slain in this way, may be said to die by his own hand, since he wilfully provoked his slayer to the act. While this is no plea for violence where it can be avoided, yet it furnishes the principle on which the oppressed and injured working-men, propose to defend themselves from the unreasonable and arrogant rapacity of their employers. They have formed themselves into labor unions, in order, through combined efforts, to prevent their masters from buying their labor at calamitously low prices, and at the same time to assert their manhood and independence. This is plainly their right. They are men: they are persons, not chattels. And every man is morally bound to respect them as such.

But now, in the effort to defend themselves the danger is,—and they have generally fallen into it—that they forget the real object of self-defense, and undertake to be executioners, and as such, to punish their employers. The *lex talionis* may be right enough in the hands of the magistrate, "for he is the minister of God, a revenger for wrath upon him that doeth evil." But executed in any other way, it becomes an unmitigated evil. The preservation of the life and property of others is as much the duty of every one, as that of self-preservation. And therefore while we must use all lawful means to protect our own interests, we are bound not to interfere with the interests of others, to their injury or destruction. It is just in this that our working-men have made their greatest mistake. It cannot indeed be denied that they have been provoked to this by the other party, yet even this does not justify lawless violence. Nor does it justify any combined action on their part, by which

all classes of society are compelled to suffer, whether innocent or guilty. Yet the course pursued by them generally comes to this bad result. They inaugurate a "strike." This stops production. The community suffers even more than the men, or the company, whom the "strike" is intended to affect. After a while the wages struck for are allowed, or the strike breaks down, and work is resumed. In consequence of the strike all classes have suffered loss. The capitalist has lost by the stoppage of his works, the laborer by the time wasted in idleness, and the community by the temporary rise in prices. Soon another strike follows, and another depression in business succeeds. So it goes; strike follows strike, combination succeeds combination, till the country is filled with strikes and rumors of strikes. The wheels of industry are stopped. Crowds gather in the streets. Incendiary speeches are made and applauded. Railroad companies are denounced. Rich men are condemned in unmeasured terms. The crowd is transmuted into an angry mob, and a diminutive war is the result. Property is wantonly destroyed. Perhaps the police interfere and disperse the mob. Many are wounded, some are killed, and then the cry reverberates through the land that the police cruelly hurt somebody in their attempts to restore a savage mob to order. At such times men who would gladly work, in order to drive the wolf from their door and save their children from starvation, are prevented, either by persuasion, by intimidation, or by actual violence. For the time being in certain localities, anarchy, destruction of property, and even murders prevail; and it becomes necessary to exert the strong arm of military power to disperse the rioters. Thus unlawful means are resorted to for the purpose of maintaining "rights." The rich nabob is without doubt not free from responsibility for the crimes thus committed. But that does not relieve the immediate perpetrators from sharing largely in the responsibility. Both are involved and both richly merit the just penalty of the law.

No one doubts, or denies, the right of different classes of men to combine their forces for mutual protection and support,

when their rights are invaded. Our revolutionary fathers combined the forces of the colonies to defend themselves against the intolerable tyranny of the mother country. A war for defense is right according to universal consent of mankind; but a war merely for conquest or power has always merited and received condemnation. Yet it is sad to know that nearly all nations have been guilty of such wars, while they have been ever ready to condemn the same thing in others. In the same way a class of men may unite for self-defense; but as soon as the combination declares an offensive war against all other classes and attempts to advance its own interests to the injury and detriment of all others who are not in the combination, it evidently transcends its rights and unwarrantably assails the rights of others. This can be justified only by the law of might. The feudal law of the middle ages, in which the strongest was the best, is the ancestor of that law by which modern combinations attempt to tyrannize over others. And that feudal law was but a modification—perhaps with little improvement—of that law of the fierce and barbarous tribes of Northern Europe, before the introduction of Christianity, which held that “might was right.” Whoever, under such a law, can wield the greatest amount of brute force enjoys the greatest right. But such a barbarous principle is utterly inconsistent with the character of American freedom, and much more so with the spirit of our holy religion. Happily it is not endorsed by the people of this country, nor by the great majority of our working population.

It is right for coal operators, manufacturers, railroad companies and merchants to form trades unions in order to increase their business, to enlarge the capacity of their works or to facilitate the means of success. But when they combine against their laborers, to grind the faces of the poor, and to extort exorbitant prices from the consumers of their products, they simply fall back to the barbarous practices of our savage ancestors. And though they seek to gain their end in a more refined and less violent way the cruelty in the end is the same or even worse.

For the savage killed the body and ended it. But the oppressors now add to the gradual starvation of the body the more poignant torture of the mind.

Again the hard-handed sons of toil have the right to organize themselves into labor unions, in order if possible to better their condition, to keep up their wages so as to support their families in comfort, and to protect themselves from the aforementioned cruelty of their employers. They have the right to demand adequate remuneration for their work, and to refuse to work for any one who will not pay that amount. All parties have rights which others are bound to respect. If the employer refuses adequate wages, the employee can justly refuse to work. But the rights of both end here. Let them separate peaceably and leave room for others.

The laborers have no right to combine for the destruction of property, or to prevent others from doing the work which they refuse to do. It is from such combinations that grow the riots, murders and destruction of property, which usually are concomitant with labor strikes. As a matter of course such proceedings only exasperate the contending parties, and thus both become strengthened in their determination to fight out the battle to the bitter end. As a result both suffer loss. The poor man's family is dragged to the verge of starvation, and the rich man's wealth is lessened. While such a barbarous policy is pursued, it is easy to see that legitimate business must become paralyzed, and all classes of society must feel the pernicious and mischievous effects of their blind folly.

A peculiarity of the latest phase of the quarrel is that it is not waged just by the oppressed poor, or by men deprived of employment, or even on account of low wages. On the contrary many of the strikers, especially on the railroads,—that in the Southwest, for example,—were employed at fair wages, with every prospect of continued employment. But an organization whose object seems to be to control capital and labor, and to assert the independence of its members, and to ostracise all who are not in sympathy with it, is taking the lead. Its

constitution and laws are said to be unfavorable to strikes and the destruction of property, and even to exclude men who are engaged in any way with the liquor traffic, which all good men regard as the great crime and withering curse of this nation. This of course sounds well. But so long as the members of the organization commit, by wholesale, all the crimes which its constitution forbids, nobody will be deceived by such good professions. When they attempt to compel a railroad company to employ Knights of Labor only, and to discharge all others; or when they demand that a knight shall not be discharged without their permission; or when they require employers to command all their employees to join their order; when they strike, destroy property, gather in crowds to disturb the peace of the communities, and disgrace themselves in drunken brawls, it is very difficult to believe that their aims are peaceable and that they honestly favor temperance and sobriety. And it is equally hard to see wherein they really assert their independence while they are enslaved to their grand master workmen to such an extent that at their nod they are willing to do anything good or bad. In fact they are ruled with a rod of iron by men who are growing fat and impudent on the hard earned wages which the workmen pay in the form of taxes to support the order. They blindly follow and obey a set of cormorants, who, under the false pretense of friendship to the laborers, are devouring their substance and at the same time inducing them to commit acts which bring discredit, disgrace and punishment to their misguided dupes. And what is of great importance to all parties, is that they forfeit the sympathy of all good men by such lawlessness. Hence in all this warfare, waged in this immoral and illegal style, the laborer becomes the loser. He loses in wasted time. He loses in self-respect. He loses in moral character. And so he pauperizes, degrades and ruins his family. The rich suffer little from their course of conduct. They live as well as they did before. But the leaders of these orders, not laborers themselves, live of the labors of the members, who, duped by these conscienceless instigators of revolt,

obey their commands as obsequiously as if they were real sovereigns *jure divino*; and in consequence of such obedience they forfeit the sympathy of mankind and afford their grand masters the means of defeating their own cause, while their own wives and children go hungry and naked.

To the evils already named another may be added, viz.: a want of confidence drives capital to the banks or to the coffers of the rich, where it idly lies, affording no good to any one. Men become afraid to invest in business, lest their property be destroyed or their trade be injured by conspiracy. The prosperity which otherwise might be enjoyed by all classes, is transmuted into adversity, the wheels of industry are stopped and the progress of the country is checked.

What has now been noticed regarding the evils growing out of this "irrepressible conflict" has reference only to the material and secular interests of men. And these seem to be the only interests regarded by the antagonists. Like the man with the "muck-rake," they seem to cast their eyes continually to the ground, apparently unconscious of a world above, and of the moral and spiritual nature, which they are starving and crushing to death by their greed of gain and power. The most significant and alarming aspect of the case appears in this ignoring of the higher nature. And this want of regard for morality and religion unveils the malevolence and malignity of the demon that instigates and spurs men on to diabolical deeds. The present attitude of the conflict shows that the spirit which animates the contestants is diametrically opposed to that of Christian ethics. Many of the leaders on both sides are infidel, and even atheistic in their beliefs. An atheistic socialism, which acknowledges no such thing as moral obligation or responsibility plainly manifests itself, and while many, perhaps the majority of the men, mean not so, yet they suffer themselves to be influenced by men who do mean to overthrow the present system of society, to trample law under foot, to crush the authority of the Church and State, and so to relieve themselves of all responsibility to any and every higher power. And thus using good

men for their tools they proceed to jeopardize the peace of society, create distracting fears among peaceable people, lead unthinking and unsuspecting men to aid them in wicked attempts to break down our free institutions and to uproot and cast to the ground the noblest principles of the social organism. They would thus bid defiance to justice, turn civil liberty into license, and overthrow the body politic, or debauch and demoralize it. Conscience is not allowed to assert its rights, and all sense of responsibility is eclipsed by the desire to rule or ruin.

A very discouraging feature, in connection with the problem, appears in the fact that influential papers, public lecturers, and even ministers of the gospel, lend countenance and support to these bad men, by their seeming attempts to foment and perpetuate the discord. Doubtless, our sympathies must lean to one side or the other, but in expressing them it behooves us to be cautious and prudent lest our words feed the flame instead of quenching it. The practice of the Golden Rule would be of immense advantage on both sides. Yet even this may be perverted in its practical effects when in our desire to favor a man in distress, or in his struggles with his antagonists, we cover up and hide his faults, while we exaggerate and hold up for execration the sins of his opponents. Just here, we think, the advocates of working-men do them an indefinite amount of harm. The poverty of the laborers is set down as all innocence, and the riches of the capitalist as all evil. And so the working-men are justified in all attempts, whether good or bad; and in the same way the rich man is just as indiscriminately condemned. This is all wrong. The rich have rights that men are bound to respect as well as the poor. And all attempts to solve the problem must prove entirely futile that fail to do justice to both sides alike.

It cannot be overlooked by any attentive observer that the latest developments of the struggle indicate that the labor organizations entertain the savage purpose of forcibly controlling both capital and labor, and of ostracising all who refuse to fall in with their methods. To this may be added the purpose of

determining just how many hours constitute a day, and just what every man must pay, and every laborer receive for such a day's work. In other words a very small minority of the working-men propose to regulate and control all the rest of the world according to their own methods, and for their own purposes, and all the outsiders must silently submit. They will have the monopoly, which they deprecate and blame in others, with a number of additional particulars thrown in, which will make them masters of the situation. While expressing our sympathy for the poor oppressed laborer, therefore, it is wise to express also our condemnation of such bad methods, and lead them, if possible, to abandon the notion that the world justifies them in the purpose to turn the tables and play oppressors and executioners of the rich. If they succeed in obtaining their *rights* that should satisfy them. By demanding too much they exasperate their enemies and alienate their friends.

The aims and methods of the Knights of Labor, as developed in the Southwest and in the cities, are not only subversive of the spirit of American liberty and American law, but contrary to the dictates of common sense. They are inimical to the welfare of all classes of society, even to the best interests of the men who have combined for the purpose of carrying them into execution. They are a perversion of the principle of right, even in its simplest primary ground. "To live and let live" is not their motto. "To live and to slay," "to rule or ruin" are practically their mottoes. Such views practically carried out are destructive of all sense of moral obligation. In fact, it is a misanthropic declaration of war against all mankind, whether rich or poor, outside of their order. And they practically say to all other laboring men, "You must join our Order, or we will not permit you to work to support your family." They say to the employer, "You must not employ any who do not belong to our order, and you must discharge all your employees who refuse to join us." It will not do to reply to these serious charges that these are only retaliatory measures. It is admitted by all reasonable men that they have suffered, and that their grievances

are real. And no one will deny them the right to defend themselves in all proper and lawful methods. In such defense all good men will give them sympathy and support. But when men see them combining and organizing, and binding themselves by solemn oath, to ruin all who do not fall in with their violent measures, they will not, they cannot, conscientiously sustain them in such a wicked and barbarous purpose.

There are said to be about nineteen millions of working-men in the United States. Of this great number, from three to five hundred thousand belong to the Knights of Labor. All the rest prefer to look out for themselves individually, or through other organizations. The Knights of Labor propose to settle the labor question, in the most arbitrary way, demanding that all others shall fall in with their ideas, or be put under ban, boycotted, starved, or even murdered. In this way, this comparatively small number are permitted to exercise a far-reaching influence that effects greater injury than benefit to the cause of labor. The great mass of the working classes are governed by infinitely better principles than these: and they will do themselves, and all other people a great favor, by keeping themselves innocent of the aims and measures of the Knights of Labor. Indeed all labor Unions would act wisely in denouncing this incendiary Order and its doings, in some public way, that all men might know that the better classes of working people do not sanction their evil doings. For it is evident to all that their ruling principle, is socialistic, communistic and infidel; and, therefore, not in sympathy with the welfare of the working-men. They seek the dissolution of society. They are the lineal descendants of that turbulent element in the social organism, which has always contributed largely to the downfall of nations and the promotion of anarchy.

This element, however, is not confined to this Order, or to the working-men. It is found equally among the rich. And when they find themselves assailed by this bad principle, moving in the ranks of their employees, they may well consider whether they are not now reaping the fruits of a harvest, which grew from

seeds of their own sowing. Of course their way of advancing their principles is refined and polished. They manage to evade the law while ostensibly obeying it. Education, cultivated society and business-like methods, enable them to appear respectable, affable, and in some cases, even generous, while yet they are constantly devising and carrying out schemes to impoverish, demoralize, degrade and even to dehumanize men, in order to use them for their own purposes. Laboring men have found them out, and in their rude ways, they are attempting to match them at their own game. Hence, the "irrepressible" nature of the conflict.

How is it to be remedied? How can the difficulties be removed? Is there any principle by which the conflict between capital and labor can be ended, and matters so adjusted, that all parties may enjoy their inalienable rights, and the antagonism be lost, in a complete restoration to harmony?

The first two questions will require more wisdom to answer than the writer possesses. But one thing appears certain; that is, if the trouble is to be remedied, the working-men must declare their independence of the kind of leaders characterized in this article. They must clear themselves from responsibility for the crimes which have been committed in their name, and act like reasonable and honest and peaceable men who desire simply what is right.

Likewise, the rich must learn to look upon their employees as *men*, respect their personality, and show a disposition to treat with them on terms of moral equality, and manifest a willingness to allow them to enjoy the full fruits of their labors.

The third question must be answered emphatically in the affirmative. The principle of Christianity, if allowed to assert itself will effect the cure. The reason why it has not long ago removed the evil, is found in the fact that both contending parties have resisted and shut it out. Not knowing or recognizing the things that pertain to peace and mutual good, they have in a manner made their house desolate.

That Christian principle can effect the cure, is evident from

the well-known fact, that where Christian employers have secured Christian employees, there are no difficulties to settle. Fair wages are paid, and good honest work is done, and in such instances the problem is solved. It is thus, after all, a very simple problem. Because the Christian principle, or the divine law of love, summarized in the Golden Rule, constrains both capitalist and laborer, to work together for the common weal, each realizing that his own interest is bound up in the interest of the other. Where this principle prevails, it is easy to see, there can be no cause for conflict. Where it does not prevail, selfishness, misdirected and blind, leads to over-reaching, which creates dislike, discontent and loss of confidence: and then the true interests of both are overlooked, and both are injured by the consequent conflict.

Let it only once be seen that every man promotes his own interest best, when he promotes that of others, and the struggle will end.

The source of this great principle is Christ Himself. Our knowledge of it is derived from the Bible. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Wherever this is practiced, experience always proves that the principle is true. The Church of Christ is the medium through which this pacific and ameliorating doctrine is promulgated. Its membership, so far as they are true to their profession, are the living embodiment and exponent of this divine principle among men. Accordingly where the influence of the Christian Church is felt and acknowledged, such difficulties and conflicts seldom arise. And where misunderstandings do occur, they are easily adjusted. The reason for this is easily explained. They follow the example of Him "who always went about doing good." They have become reconciled to God through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. They have been renewed and transformed by His word and Spirit, and become conformed to His image.

They have been taught to know the frailty, the weakness and the wickedness of human nature, and have learned that they are

what they now are by the grace of God which has brought them salvation, and reconciled them to Himself. And remembering the "hole of the pit" from which they were delivered, they pity the weakness of human nature in others, and instead of cultivating its selfishness in themselves, they do all in their power to rescue others from its galling chains, and bring them into the same liberty which they themselves enjoy. In this spirit they direct all their endeavors to the elevation of their fellows, in all their relations in life, so as, if possible, to secure them in possession of all that is involved "in the life that now is," as well as "in the life that is to come."

But the unbelieving world manifests a different spirit. There the Gospel is rejected. The law of love is trampled under foot, and the sense of moral obligation is practically denied and set aside. Men allow themselves to be governed by their passions. They delight in evil deeds. Not satisfied with promoting their own interests, they must needs injure the interests of others, as if such injury to others could somehow become a benefit to themselves. Hence they are arrogant, selfish, revengeful and envious, and take pleasure in the pain they can inflict on others. Hence efforts to destroy society, to abolish law, to make an equal distribution of property, and to compel others to submit to their tyrannical and unreasonable behests. While men enslave themselves under such evil habits and purposes, there can be little hope of solving this labor problem. For as experience has abundantly shown in the recent past, as soon as you think you have settled one difficulty another will arise. Comply with one demand and another is forthcoming. If you arbitrate they will not honestly stand by it. If you make a law to punish them they defy it, and rush madly on to their own destruction, and to the discomfort and annoyance of others.

But Christianize them, and the war will end for want of adversaries. Without this there is no hope. Human nature, unregenerated, is hopelessly bad. But when it is regenerated, the new principle of life which is engendered thereby, becomes

a corrective within the individual heart. And the principle thus born within, developing itself in outward conduct, will not only ameliorate and elevate the condition of the individual, but it will reach out and renovate society at large, and restore its jarring elements to a state of harmony which will be followed by uninterrupted prosperity and happiness. The employer, and the employee alike will be animated by the spirit and principle of the Gospel; and there will follow such an adjustment between capital and labor that the former will not oppress and the latter will not rebel. But both will work in harmony for the common good. The rights of all will be respected. "Good-will on earth and peace to men" will prevail. This, of course, is ideal. But it is the aim of the Church to realize it in actual life, and the sooner men recognize her influence and accept her divine teachings, the sooner will the problem of social life be solved.

V.

INTELLECTUAL RELIGION.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

DOES IT not seem important just now to call attention to the necessity of urging an intellectual religion, in order that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work?

Let us observe here, however, that when we urge attention to *intellectual* religion we do not mean to disparage, in the slightest degree, *heart* religion. Religion is pre-eminently a heart matter. The first element of the great commandment of the law which Christ mentioned, was this, "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart." And even as this is mentioned first, we must not forget that it is first in importance. Intellectual religion alone is not complete. Unless the intellect is prompted by and filled with spirituality of heart in religion, it is unsatisfactory and very incomplete. Intellectuality in religion is desirable, but if it is devoid of spirituality, or at the expense of it, it utterly fails in attaining the true end of the religion of Jesus. Icebergs that float majestically in the northern seas are entrancingly beautiful as they sparkle in the sunlight, but come near them or touch them, how cold, how repellent they are, in spite of their beauty! So is a merely intellectual Christian. As you hear his flowing words, and rounded periods, and cultured voice, he may appear beautiful and great, but come in close quarters with him, be near him, and how cold is his heart! It chills you! We may walk through many an art gallery in this country and in Europe lined with beautiful statuary. We may stand entranced before the statues, complete in every particular, and yet touching them—

oh! how heartless, how bloodless, how emotionless! Just so are many intellectual Christians. Beautiful, but alas! heartless, cold, emotionless. Nay, intellectuality alone is incomplete. We were never more forcibly impressed with the truth of this than when we noticed the difference in the effect produced upon our own soul, and from all appearances upon the souls of all others, in a service we attended in Spurgeon's Tabernacle in London, and another in St. Paul's Cathedral. In the former, though with a good degree of intellectuality, yet spirituality, prevailed—*heart* religion was predominant. And how blessed, how stirred, how inspired were our souls as we left the church. We could not but be better men and women. We felt sick of sin. Oh! how firmly we resolved to fight anew against temptation and sin, and to live near to God. Very different was our experience in the elaborate, intellectual, pompous service in St. Paul's Cathedral, after listening to a labored, intellectual sermon by an Archbishop of the Church of England. We were impressed, 'tis true. But it was not an impression which made us long to be nearer Jesus' heart, to live better lives, to do more good in the world, to consecrate body and soul to Christ. One cannot help but notice also, as he travels in Holland and Germany, how far short the preaching of the ministers of the rationalistic churches there, come to build up the soul in love and joy and peace, however beautiful and complete intellectually are their sermons.

Therefore, let us not be misunderstood in this article. Whilst we earnestly urge much more *mind*, *intellect* in religion, we urge no less *heart* in it. It is not that we plead for less heart, but more mind.

With these necessary preliminary remarks we come to inquire,—

I. First, what is meant by an intellectual religion?

There is heart religion and there is mind religion. Each is distinct from, but ought not to be independent of, and is not complete without, the other. By intellectual religion in this connection is meant an intelligent understanding of the funda-

mental principles of religion; that upon which as a foundation, the heart rests and builds up its faith and hope and trust. A person cannot be said to be an intelligent Christian unless he knows what he believes in. That is to say, unless his faith is based upon known principles and facts.

And further, a person is never a Christian who will be able to endure hardship and temptation and trial, if he has not an understanding of the principles and facts of religion. He is very apt to fall away. He is as one who builds a house on sand, and not on a solid foundation. It is, therefore, not only unsatisfactory, but also unsafe for ministers to preach "believe," "believe," unless they first teach what is to be believed, or urge the people to study to know the principles which constitute the system of belief. To discard creeds, or systematized forms of belief, call them, if you please, "confessions of faith," is dangerous and unscientific, as well as extremely unreasonable. This, however, is done quite popularly in our day. "Away with creeds!" "Away with Confessions of Faith!" are the cries we hear loudly made. "Believe only in the grand principles of Christianity. This is enough, this saves." Thus say many. Exactly. But what are these "grand principles?" Shall the orthodox churches be blamed for holding to confessions of faith, and to creeds which they believe to contain and express the "grand principles of Christianity." This cry is like a man saying, "Believe in the grand principles of Astronomy," and then throwing aside and destroying formulated systems of Astronomy. An intellectual religion is such as holds to and understands fundamental principles clearly expressed, definitely formulated in creeds and confessions of faith, and not vaguely, indefinitely known and stated.

This definiteness of doctrine, however, is called in our day *dogmatism*. The school of "liberal thinkers" so called, chafe under any systematized forms of belief, and speak of them as if they are manacles to hold their souls from high spiritual flights. What is to be done under such circumstances? Is the pulpit to yield to such criticism, and not preach definite

doctrines? Are the people to give up creeds and confessions of faith? No, a hundred times, *No*. How can the gospel trumpet give forth a clear, certain sound, unless there is something definite to be sounded?

So-called "liberal thinkers" are eloquent enough when it comes to telling their congregation what Christianity is *not*. But if you ask them what it is they say at once, "Oh! to answer that question would be dogmatizing!"

Listening to a sermon by one of the representative "advanced thinkers (?)" we heard him say, "in speaking of the Christian Church, that it was not this, that, nor the third thing, but it was an organism founded for the development within and without of the notions dear to it." Very true. But will he please tell us what these notions are? Does he state these? No. That, according to him and his class, would be dogmatizing. We continually hear such men talk about the "grand ideas of Christianity," but if we ask what they believe these to be, they are silent. Is there reason, is there sense, is there intelligence in this? And yet, if Presbyterians or Methodists or Baptists agree among themselves what they believe these "grand ideas" are, and formulate them into confessions of faith, this they call *narrow-mindedness*. If they do not believe these creeds and confessions to be true, or to teach Bible truths, let them tell us what the Scriptures do teach. Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, etc., believe that the Bible teaches certain truths, and hence consistently formulate these into confessions of faith and accept them as the truth taught. Now this is honest; this is consistent, this is reasonable, this is an intellectual religion.

II. Secondly, it will not be difficult to learn why it is important to urge such an intellectual religion.

1. *Our age demands it.*

This is an age of intense intellectuality in all departments of life. It is becoming universally seen and recognized that there is a science of all things. And religion is not the least science in the world. The following three points are said to constitute

physical science: (1) Observation of facts; (2) Induction of laws from those facts; (3) Verification of these laws by experiment. *Our religion includes these three steps, and hence is a science. In the words of James F. Clarke, "The facts of consciousness constitute the basis of religious science. These *facts* are as real, and as constant, as those which are perceived through the senses. Faith, Hope and Love are as real as form, sound, color. The moral *laws* also, which may be deduced from such experience are real and permanent, and these laws can be verified in the daily course of human life. If this is so it will make the science of religion possible."

Men require clear-cut definitions in all sciences, definite principles upon which the science is founded; and shall we then not have these in religion? If creeds and confessions of faith are such clear-cut definitions, and classified definite principles of religion, are we to destroy them? Does not our age on the contrary demand these? Why shall we be asked in religion to destroy them, and the very opposite be demanded in other departments? Do we not know that a demand is made more and more strongly every day for sciences to be made definite? to be expressed in systematized forms? Why then shall religion be asked to lay aside its systematized beliefs, and hold to only general, undefined principles? Nay, it is not dogmatism on the part of the church which urges acceptance of a creed and the study of "Confessions of Faith," and catechism, but it is simply following out rational procedures adopted by all departments of the sciences. Our age, which asks for principles upon which to base itself, demands, therefore, an intelligent understanding of the fundamental principles of religion; in other words an intellectual religion.

But further, if in any age Christians have been called upon to give a reason for the faith that is in them, it is this age. The religion of Jesus is beset by questions on every side. This is an inquiring age. This is an age of critical research, of severe and close investigation. Superstition and credulity in all their forms have

* "Ten Great Religions," pt. ii., p. 4, by James F. Clarke.

taken unto themselves wings and are fast flying away. This is an age of many interrogation points. These stare us in the face at every turn. And especially in religion. To be a Christian means not simply to belong to some religious organization, or to belong to a Christian community or family, but it means, in its special sense, to have within the heart certain principles and motives which make for righteousness. And these principles are severely called in question in our day. Oh! how necessary for Christians to understand them fully. We need, oh! we need urgently, intelligent Christians in our day. Christians ought not to be one whit behind the world in readiness to be able to give a reason for the hope that is within them.

2. *The cause demands it.*

Shall the important matter of the soul's salvation not be intelligently understood? The cause of Christ in itself is too important that the principles of it shall not be learned by its adherents. The salvation of the soul is too important than that one should not know the reasons which there are for believing in it. Matters pertaining to God, to Jesus the Christ, to heaven, to immortality, are too transcendently important than that one should credulously accept of them, and not be persuaded of the reasons which there are for believing in and accepting of them. True, our religion is a religion of *faith*. Faith is its watchword. Without faith Christianity cannot stand. From the very nature of the case it must be so. But this does not mean that a person must be credulous; must be superstitious. This does not mean a *blind* faith. There is such a thing as an *intelligent* faith—faith founded upon experience and known facts. And this being the case, the cause demands that there be an intellectual religion, a religion that is a clear-sounding trumpet. The Church of Christ needs clear-sounding gospel-trumpets in our day. Uncertain sounds ought not to be given from the pulpits. One need be but a very superficial observer of the age to be persuaded, "That aside from Christian faith there is manifest no single regulative principle" in politics, in society,

in philosophy, or in science. Theories of men, clamoring loudly for acceptance, and offering themselves as the "final philosophy" are, in the words of Prof. Welch, "condemned by Christian faith, not only as contradictory and hostile to each other, but as being incomplete and inadequate each in itself, yet dogmatic and persistent as if each were infallible. In this way, especially, they are disturbing the public judgment, unsettling men's minds, and producing confusion, public and private." What we want amid this prevalent confusion is a voice intelligent, authoritative, final, satisfactory, clear and distinct. "What we need is not the false light, but the true; true Christian faith, true science, reason, conscience, true religion. These will prove regulative. Thus shall we move toward order instead of confusion. We want the Christian faith which reposes upon the abiding truth of God and His word—both the written and the living Word—the Scriptures and Christ; upon the spiritual witness of the soul; the attestation of conscience; the affirmations of reason; the evidences of matured science." And we want a distinct, clear enunciation of this faith—a *definiteness* of teaching, learned and appreciated by all Christians. Oh! for definite, positive preaching, teaching and believing! The lack of it is dangerous to the cause of Christ. It leads to a negative religion. And as some one has well said: "A Church which lays intense emphasis on what it does *not* believe, and whose members know not how to express any article of faith without a negative particle, is a nursery of skepticism and infidelity, and nothing better."

Further than this, unless there is an intelligent faith, the opposer of Christianity has the advantage of the Christian. How often does not a scoffer make sport of an unintelligent Christian—a Christian who has never taken the trouble to learn the principles in which he professes to believe—who is a Christian because his "folks" are, and because he has an idea that he had better be, and it is just the thing to be. Such Christians are often ridiculous—simple. And it is no wonder that the scoffer makes fun of such. What a sad reproach

such are to the cause. The grand, glorious, heavenly cause of Christ, founded upon eternal principles of truth, demands of its adherents a full knowledge of these principles. In the presence of an intelligent Christian—one who has studied the principles of Christ and His kingdom, no scoffer can stand; he must hide his head in shame and confusion. Shall one make fun of God? of heaven? of immortality? of Jesus? in the presence of one fully imbued with the principles underlying an intelligent belief in these. He cannot; he dare not. Just as the gambler in his den would slink in shame and confusion should one who had the "purity of inward life" enter it; just as the robber in the wilderness threw down his weapons and cowed in shame and sorrow at the feet of John the Divine, who appeared before him, so will any scoffer hide in silence before the presence of one who, filled with the holy principles of Christ, cannot but live them, and exemplify them in all their power in his very appearance. Were Christians but deeply versed in the holy truths of God's word they would be powerful and strong, they would honor the Master, and greatly advance His cause.

3. A third reason we mention why it is important to urge an intellectual religion is: *individual Christians need it.*

They need it not only because the age and the cause demand it of them, but they need it for their own good. They are our powerful Christians, reliable Christians, who know whereof they speak; who are rooted and grounded in the principles of God's Word. You never hear of such falling away and becoming a reproach to the cause of Christ. They stand when storms of opposition come: when contrary winds blow. They stand like the sturdy oak in the forest, whose roots are strong and deep, unaffected by the tempests' beating. If the roots of the faith of the Christians are not grounded firmly in the eternal principles of God's Word, they cannot endure the beating of the tempest and the raging of the storm. It is dangerous for the soul not to be such Christians. Why, self-protection should lead us to be careful in this matter. Who fall away generally

from the Church? Whose names soon become unmeaning on the Church's roll of membership? Who are but nominal Christians? Who but those who have joined the Church under excitement, or from mercenary motives, and do not study to grow in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; who do not become grounded in the faith. Do you ever hear of a person who is faithful to grow in grace not only, but also in the *knowledge* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as returning to the beggarly elements of the world? as becoming a mere nominal Christian? No, but they grow in power more and more, adding "precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little;" they grow in power for God, for truth, for righteousness. Such stand like a house built upon an eternal rock.

In order that the individual may be a true and happy Christian he needs to be an intelligent Christian. True spirituality of heart and a loving, devoted, personal, cheering piety, cannot be maintained unless one is an intelligent Christian. What saved the individual and gave him peace of soul, but a return to an intelligent understanding and an individual study of God's Word, when he was swallowed up and lost in ignorance of it, by the Church in Luther's time? A diffusion of Christian knowledge and of the principles of Christianity among the people, a return to intellectual religion, saved men's personal religion. The Church never truly prospers, never truly grows in power for truth and righteousness unless there is an attention paid to a high degree of Christian knowledge among the people. Chain the Bible in dingy cathedrals and monks' cells, make it a sealed book as far as the people are concerned, and you destroy personal religion, and personal religion being destroyed, you destroy the only religion which gives true spiritual power and growth to the soul, and this being destroyed, the Church becomes a failure. Why is the name *Scotchman* a synonym for a noble, staunch, firm, man of God? Is it not the intellectual religion which prevails there, and which prevailed especially in the last two or three centuries? "They

were taught to read, if taught nothing more, that they might at any rate be able to read the Bible—the word of God. This was the proud pre-eminence of every Scotsman of those days; he could read the Bible and knew its meaning word for word, equally with the most learned in the land. Alone of all the peasantry in Europe the Scottish peasantry as a body could do this, and often by fireside and wayside,

‘ Reasoned high
Of Providence, foreknowledge, will and fate.
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute.’ ”

Thus writes one in the “*Scottish Review*” concerning Scotland during the time from the Reformation to the Revolution; he continues: “How the spirit of these men continued into the next century we also know; and the wrestlings and wreckage which fill it are among the saddest things in history. Parish schools were few enough in the first half of the seventeenth century, yet the intelligence of the people astonished their Episcopal well-wishers, Bishops Burnet and Leighton, who were amazed, as the former of them tells us, to see how the very meanest of them, even their cottagers and their servants, could argue on the points of government and the power of princes in the matters of religion. Upon all these topics they had texts of Scripture at hand, and were ready with their answers to anything which was said to them.” Truly, individual study of God’s word, resulting in an intellectual religion, “has made Scotland what she is, and given her a people which for intellectual fire and sustained strength of purpose and endurance has no equal. Long distracted and spent in conflict and self-defense these high qualities shone out in brilliant individual forms when peace and quiet prevailed; and in Hume, Burns, Scott, Livingstone and Carlyle has given us types of human nature of universal interest and the most commanding influence.” *

Some time ago in the city of St. Louis I was privileged to be

* *Scottish Review*.

the guest of a native Scotchman. The first characteristic I observed was the unusual Christian intelligence shown by the entire family. My host led me into the parlor and pointed to a large portrait of his mother, long since gone to her heavenly home, sitting near a table upon which lay a Bible and Baxter's works; in her hand open before her she held Boston's "Fourfold State,"—books which require a study to master. "Such were the everyday books," said my host, "which we saw our parents read, and which we were made to read when we grew old enough to begin to understand them." And then, with a sigh, he added: "How different it is to-day!" I thought as I stood before the portrait: "No wonder that Scotland has such a remarkable history religiously." And I thought, too: "How different, indeed, from our reading!" Who reads books of that character now? Dime novels, trashy, evanescent literature prevail; or light stories redeemed from positive and complete irrelevancy to Christianity by an unimportant, inconspicuous religious vein running through them. Such find their way into many Sabbath-school libraries! And this sort of literature is to feed the souls of children and youth! Oh! these produce not tough Christian sinew and bone; these produce spiritual dyspepsia.

It is not due to a pessimistic spirit that we say that in this we are retrograding, however fast we may be advancing in other things. A great deal of fun is made of, and criticism expended upon the old custom of catechetical instruction; and perhaps it is not practicable for our age to return to it, but much is to be said in its favor. We smile perhaps at the enthusiasm displayed by the foreign delegates at the great Synod of Dordrecht in regard to the courses pursued in securing the study of the Heidelberg Catechism, especially the course pursued in Switzerland and Hessel. When asked in regard to it, the delegates from these countries replied: "Whenever in our country a young couple desire to marry, they are required previously to appear before the pastor and to sustain an examination in the Catechism. If their knowledge of it is found to be defective the wedding is postponed

until they show greater familiarity with that symbol." * But in that age, when catechetical instruction was so prevalent, there were staunch Christian men and women formed, who stood up for the faith nobly, and whose courage and staunchness and religious intelligence secured to us the distinguishing blessings of our spiritual, free, intelligent Christian institutions. Sabbath-schools, it is said, are taking the place and are doing the work formerly done by Catechetical instruction. Yes, thank God for the institution of the Sabbath-school. But is the fear not well grounded that its work is not so conducted that it is producing men and women powerful in the knowledge of systematic Bible truth as did our schools of Catechetical instruction? If the Sabbath-school is to take the place of catechetical *instruction*, let us pray that our Sabbath-schools may produce men and women staunch in the faith of God's Word, well versed in the knowledge of the fundamental doctrines of Christ's Church!

The conclusion of the whole matter is this:

1. The pulpit should not cater to the suicidal cry from many quarters in our day for sentimental or sensational preaching and teaching, but should preach and teach systematized doctrine—that which normally feeds and nourishes the soul.

2. Family instruction in the Bible should not be neglected, and relegated to the work of the Sabbath-school, but should be faithfully attended to.

3. Sabbath-schools should be very careful to give sound and substantial, and not light or sensational instruction to scholars.

4. Individuals should be zealous and persevering in daily private study of God's Word, and not a hurried reading, for conscience' sake, of a few verses now and then.

If these four points were observed, what increased power for good would there be exercised in the world by Christians! What great blessings would come from God upon communities! What joy and peace and love would fill all hearts, and how fully prepared would they be made for the kingdom of God in heaven!

* Hansen's History of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, p. 173.

VI.

THE ONE SIGN.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF.

THAT indicated a stupendous clash of opinion when the Pharisees and Sadducees demanded a sign from heaven, and Jesus told them that they failed to discern the signs of the times. He had done many things by which His divine power and authority were fully demonstrated, and which pointed to the presence of a crisis in the history of the human race such as had not come before. The significance and aim of what was now at hand could not be signalised merely by the signs of by-gone days. The divine and human were now in close personal historic union, and the signs of the times in accord with this central world-historic fact stood for spiritual regeneration of man and of human kind, direct and personal, rather than for any outward display of miraculous power over the physical forces of nature.

The miracles of Jesus made a strong impression. Many were led to suspect, when they saw what He did, that at last a great prophet had once more risen in Israel, if, indeed, the Messiah was not actually at hand. Therefore they had visions of a coming world empire, of the destruction of the Roman power and of the universal supremacy of the throne of David. And to make sure of all this a sign from heaven, such as was given in the days of Moses or of Joshua, was demanded. Such a sign, it was taken, would be in perfect harmony with the ancient traditions of the covenanted people and an infallible guarantee that the divine promises should presently be realized in a grand world historic way. Hence measures were in contemplation to make the Nazarene king after the multitudes had witnessed

His astounding miracles. And as He foiled them at every attempt of this kind, and yet continued to urge His claims with a most positive authority, the friction between Him and the representatives of the secularized notions of His people became more and more intense and direct.

This caused the combined demand of the two rival sects for a sign from heaven. They were told that a sign should be given them, long since made historic in the life of the chosen people, the sign of the prophet Jonas. This brought the issue to a fixed point. The dramatic history of the ancient prophet prefigured what was to be the primal historic force and central energy of the world's redemption. Jesus—living, suffering, dying and rising from the dead the third day—puts Himself forward as the one sign which stands for all the ages, and to which is relegated the destiny of mankind. In his divine-human person, thus humbled and exalted, were fulfilled and realized all the Messianic promises and hopes back to the days of Jonas and beyond, to paradise and the fall; and from Him were to proceed the divine impulses which lift the race to the sense of universal brotherhood and universal redemption.

It is sad, indeed, that the secularized hopes of the day stood in the way of this Christologic, or, rather, Christocentric solution of the dignity and destiny of manhood, and that neither the Pharisees nor the Sadducees had the moral capacity to rise to the proper conception of the historic genius and design of the Old Testament economy. But we, who are far more favored than they, having the Christologic growth and experience of nearly nineteen centuries to guide us in our judgment, ought to be slow to judge those who lived when all the grand historic evolutions of the Christian life were yet in the future, and when the fearful pressure of the times was calculated to make the Abrahamic stock adhere rigidly to its historic identity and secular hopes. We, with our greater light and comprehensive knowledge of the progress of the world under the control and moulding power of the Christian faith, find ourselves so much mixed up with the material and secular movements and interests of the

age that we are slow to see, what was, and is still, and forever shall be, the one centre and primal force by which the social world lives and moves and has its being. And since we, living at this advanced age and so long after Jesus was confronted with the scepticism of His generation, become so easily confused in so plain and boldly defined a historic issue, we should stand modest and dumb in the presence of the blind unbelief of the Jews at the coming in of our era.

The Pagan world, it is well understood, remained under absolute power against which there was no remedy in the way of individual and social progress. And this was because the Pagan world was ignorant of the origin of man and of his dignity and destiny. But where Christianity took root the case was soon found to be radically different. Here the individual advanced and society developed into comparatively free and self-reliant communities and nationalities. It is true the process of growth in the history of Christendom went forward in the face of gigantic conflicts. Arbitrary power on the one hand, and arbitrary individual caprice on the other, came largely to view. But out of this conflict, guided by the historic genius of the gospel, came the magnificent harmony and sublime aim of our modern life, which has the promise of universal triumph in the unification of the race. It is just here where we are called upon to study and comprehend the distinctive character of our era and our day, lest we remain as ignorant of the real significance of what is passing before our modern eyes as were the Pharisees and Sadducees, and all others not in the secret of the Christologic world-fact, of the import and testimony of the sign of their day.

European life presents an interesting subject of study. There was a continual tendency to war, to a violent breaking up into factions and municipalities and powers in opposition to the enforcement of authority. This state of things was chronic and ran through the ages, and was taken to be a fixed order of things that would not likely be surmounted. And just here it was that the Christian world failed to comprehend the necessary outcome of the genius of its own faith. The promise and di-

vine guarantee was from the beginning that there should be ultimate unification, harmony and peace; but as far as men could see there was only strife, persecution and war. And this chronic state of antagonism is still largely in force. Up to the beginning of our century there was hardly a tangible sign that this awful spell of social conflict should ever be broken. Now, however, it looks as if we had reached a grand climax, and as if modern history was at last flowing in the current of a common brotherhood and of the complete unification of the nationalities of the world under the banner of a common faith.

Italy, as a country, has a history of thirty centuries, but its political unification was reached for the first time only a few years ago. During many hundreds of years the people of this classic peninsula spoke one language and had one religion, and yet they could not unite as one people and political power in the family of European Christendom. Finally their deep-rooted antagonisms of such long standing have been overcome as by an unseen divine force, at a time when the leading minds of the period looked for nothing but the usual failure, and Italy stands at last as a national unit among the dominant powers of the continent. Germany has a somewhat similar history. She, in spite of her strongly-marked popular identity, her language, her religion and her territorial position, all of which suggested the wisdom of political economic unity, was for a long time divided into scores of warring principalities and powers. And to get an idea how this fragmentary condition of the Teutonic family worked for the safety and peace of its members, one needs only to have a glimpse of the bloody wars of Frederick II. of Prussia and of the stupendous campaigns of Napoleon. But although the Germans felt this great national evil keenly, and dreamt of national unity for centuries, they found it possible only under the pressure of the late war with France to rise to the dignity of a German empire and to take their place as one of the foremost powers of Europe.

These are only a few instances showing the present ruling tendencies of the life and politics of the Old World. The his-

toric sweep of these tendencies is much broader than the territories of the two nations just brought into notice. The life of Europe is running more or less in the same current and struggling towards the same goal. The unifying temper of the times is reaching out even beyond the boundaries of the continent, and is drawing the tribes and nationalities of other continents and of the islands of the seas into its broad drift. This makes it look as if the unification of the race was not only probable in agreement with Christologic hopes and promises, but that it is actually going forward rapidly under the pressure of modern ideas and tendencies. On this side of the broad Atlantic the movement is far in advance. Our history dates back a century or two only. It started under the full force of the chronic tendency to divide. Those who came here as early settlers fled from home and country in the old world to find toleration and freedom in the new. Colonies were founded under the authority of the British crown, but these had no sense of nationality or power to unite as one people. Increasing troubles with the mother country drove them gradually into a confederation, but this hung very loosely together. The great revolutionary struggle prepared the way for the coming nation and led to the organization of the general government. Yet when this climax was reached the old habit of flying apart and falling to pieces was not left behind. For the greater part of a century the union of States was tried and strained by sectional differences and conflicting theories of the rights of the States and the powers of the national authorities. Through all this the republic has passed triumphantly, and the nation now is a unit and a power in a broad historic sense. The territorial domain, the language, the religion of the country, all have much to do with the strength and significance of her unity as a nation, but the basis of this grand national union lies still deeper than any or all of these specific elements of its existence may suggest. It is a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and is firmly rooted in the popular conviction of the brotherhood of men and the equality of all before the law. Of course we have

not come to absolute perfection in the enforcement of the central conception of the times. Our growth in this direction is not complete, but it has carried such volume and force that nothing can likely prevent it from coming to the full fruition of its sublime ideal. Whatever comes in conflict with this pronounced cardinal temper, of our American life and national unity, is confronted as the enemy, not of the nation only, but of the race, and such a power cannot easily be resisted or diverted from its well-defined aims.

Hence we stand in the front rank of the family of nations, not by diplomatic policy or formal treaty, but by the moral force of our advanced ideas and the genius of our institutions. And looking at the present status of the secular world all around us from our American standpoint, and seeing the tendency everywhere towards the development of strong unified nationalities and an equitable balance of power, we may be excused for entertaining the hope and even the fixed opinion that the whole race is approaching a magnificent culmination. Napoleon had the ambition to strike for the political union of Europe under his imperial headship, and he fought sanguinary battles to compel the nations to submit to his demands. The spirit and the method of this Napoleonic attempt were, however, as foreign to the genius of modern civilization as were the conquests of Alexander and the imperial aspirations of Julius Cæsar. The unity of the day is coming by more humane methods, and these methods are meeting with better success. Oriental castes and other kindred wrongs and evils have long since dropped out of the economy of our Western life. May we not look for the speedy removal of still remaining barbarisms and an era of unity and freedom which shall proceed to cover the earth.

But it is time we should return to the consideration of the religious aspect of this great question. Secularism in its best sense, and in its broadest scope and most humanizing significance, is but one side of the life of the race. Religion and the church are on the other side and make up a primal factor of

all social progress. These two historic forces, the secular and the religious, are so intimately related that the tendencies of the one are shared by the other, and both together are often judged by the same standard. The church divided as the secular world did, and that in a similar conflict of authority and freedom. This conflict started far back in the past, but its culmination came in the sixteenth century. Since then the breaking away from the sense of ecclesiastical unity has been radical and extreme; so much so indeed that it was taken to be normal and fixed like the kindred habit of politics. But times change and so do the ideas and habits of the religious world. The tide is evidently turning and we are beginning to drift toward a unity of churches that will perhaps be more grand and effective than anything of the kind that has yet been realized. It will not likely be a unity under the enforced primacy of any outward authority. It will rather be the spontaneous growth of a fellow feeling coming from a common faith and fraternal devotion to the one great cause of Christ and humanity.

There are signs of a growing tendency of this kind, and this tendency is running very much like that of the political world. Churches of a kindred spirit and faith are forming alliances or are entering into organic union. In this way strong organizations are growing up which will have great influence in putting forward the claims of religion and Christian morality. And along with this denominational growth will come also greater harmony and co-operation between the various ecclesiastical bodies. Such union will create a Catholic evangelic force and plastic power which cannot be easily hindered or defeated in carrying the light of the gospel to the ends of the earth, and in lifting the race more and more out of the narrow ruts of a carnal secularism. If this is an age specifically inclined to doubt and unbelief, as we are often reminded and warned, it is emphatically also an age of revival of apostolic zeal and energy. In this lies a great promise for the future. The schisms of the past and of the present are being overruled for good, and will

help immensely in making a unity of the broadest and most beneficent kind possible. And the scientific antagonisms to the dogmas of the church and of Christianity have already had the effect of drawing out the energies of the religious mind, and will likely arouse it more and more as the issues of the contest become more direct and positive. This measuring of strength need cause no alarm to those who can appreciate the value of both the secular and the religious in our historic world process. Religion can never be driven out of the world or dispensed with, and as long as the religion of Jesus is the one power which can satisfy the ethical and spiritual needs of the race better than any other faith either ancient or modern, all the superficial talk of the day about the ultimate destruction of it amounts to nothing. And however welcome the success of physical and mental science will ever be to intelligent thinking religious men, they feel perfectly sure that no such science can ever evolve a religious creed or consciousness that can hold both mind and heart like that set forth in the Bible and maintained by the Christian world.

The church and her Christologic culture have been a primal force of human progress, and they are so still. And antagonisms from the outside can do no harm as long as the church stands faithfully by the Christologic genius of her creed. Indeed such antagonisms will do her good not only in arousing her to greater energy, but also in bringing together her divided forces for a united activity and advance. There need be no conflict at all. Secular and religious life should run in harmony. The church should not crush or depress material progress—rather should she quicken and mould it; and material energy and growth should never ignore or antagonize the moral support and guardianship of the church. Hence if these two factors get into hostile conflict there is something wrong somewhere. The hostilities of the past show conclusively that there was a radical misconception of mutual relationship. It is a happy circumstance that the enlarged views, which rule the temper of popular thinking in our day, make it possible to

promptly correct errors of this sort and to make our progressive energies move smoothly along.

The cause of missions forces itself with specific emphasis on the mind of the churches at this time. The time of the Gentiles seems to be fully at hand. The Christian world, with its secular and religious supremacy, has too potent an influence to be any longer rivalled and resisted by the degrading superstitions of Paganism, and the name of Christ once hated with a perfect hatred is becoming a charm to Gentile ears. Already heathen countries are honey-combed with mission stations. The churches are earnestly at work and are increasing and unifying their forces. The idea is inspiring. The mere prospect of unifying the race and getting the nations to adopt the creed, usages and customs of our modern world is enough to draw out the enthusiastic co-operation of a live people; but when we contemplate in connection with this the unification of the various branches of the church for the sublime purpose of making her mission an absolute and speedy success, the inspiring force of the movement is increased without limit.

And the home-field is no less in need of these combined energies and resources. The scattered membership of the churches should be gathered and organized, and there should be no waste of means in doing it. And the large masses outside of the church should be reached and drawn in. Hence the call for greater unity along with increased zeal and energy. Besides the rising moral and social issues of the times will have to be met. Marriage and divorce, as these have been allowed to run, require serious and effective control. The education and practical enfranchisement of the colored people and the industrial training and Christianization of the Indians, need the guardianship and aid of a united Christian people. The rapid increase of the ignorant and dangerous classes in our large towns, cities and business centres, warn us that we must join hands in bringing these people under proper religious and moral influence. The liquor traffic is a monstrous evil and an aggressive power—it will have to be met

and corrected by a no less powerful and determined popular will. Pauperism and a multitude of other social problems are already knocking at our doors, and are asking for a rational solution. These matters belong to the civil government but they cannot be left to its exclusive management. It will be difficult enough to get them under satisfactory control when the civil powers are backed up by all the moral support a united Christian constituency can give them. And these pressing issues are not away in Europe, or in the far off Oriental World, or in the islands of the distant seas. They confront us at our doors, in our families, in the forums of the commonwealth and in the politics of the Republic. They are a practical matter-of-fact reality and in a practical matter-of-fact way will they have to be met and settled. Undoubtedly, therefore, it is a plain case that the growing unity of the church is a necessity and a guarantee of the future culture and progress of the race, as it has been a main factor of its historic advancement hitherto.

It is a matter of comfort that, in the arena of controversy and criticism, Christian scholars of all ages and climes have triumphantly withstood the onslaughts of unbelief. It is well to wield the sword of learned argument. Still the primary force of the Christian faith lies largely in the beneficence and charitable work, and in the full round of an enlightened church activity. We have had an era of intense dogmatic evolution and of skilful biblical criticism, and we may now look for a larger measure of the beneficent energy of a full grown Christological unity. But what has all this to do with the tragic history of the prophet Jonas, which our Lord put forward as the one sign by which it should be known whence His authority came to claim the faith and obedience of His people?

The ancient Hebrew prophet, being cast into the sea and swallowed by a great fish but brought safely to land again on the third day, is made the typical exponent of the personal history of the Son of God. Why this one sign and this one only? Was it arbitrary to insist upon this and refuse the sign asked for, when it was well understood that such evidences

of the guardian care of Jehovah had been freely given in the early history of the Hebrew nation.

Jesus stood in the bosom of His generation, and in the life of a fallen race, a sinless man endowed with all the graces of a perfect manhood. And as such He had at His command the full power of the infinite personal God. For this reason His relation to the race was that of the second Adam and generic head. He had not come to teach only and to set a good example, as many had done before, but to regenerate and to create anew. Hence His personality became at once the centre force of the progress of mankind. Being free from all moral taint and above the carnal secular hopes and aims of His day, and having the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in Him bodily. He was voluntary sufferer from the beginning to the end of His life. He died and was buried, and on the third day He rose from the dead. This makes a complete historic parallel between Him and His typical forerunner in the distant past. Yet where this parallel ends the sublime Christocentric significance of the historic coincidence only begins. It was a singular method to challenge the faith and submission of the world by thus going down into the very depths of ignominy and human misery, and it is still more singular that this strange method has succeeded so admirably that it is now on the verge of a final triumph over all that may stand in its way. The sign of the prophet Jonas has thus become a standing sign for all ages, and its historico-Christocentric force and significance must be taken as the guiding star of both the religious and the secular world in their onward unifying movement.

This sign has ever been spoken against. Skeptical critics did their utmost to reduce the story of Jonah to the level of Oriental myths, and the champions of modern materialism assume with great alacrity the likeness of Pagan incarnations and the divine-human personality of Jesus Christ. And so we see that the two narratives, that of the prophet and that of Christ, are both deprived of their supernatural character by the skepticism of the day. Both must stand or fall together,

therefore, on the principle of divinity on which they are made to rest. There can be no question of the possibility of the restoration of Jonah by the same power that raised Jesus from the dead, neither can there be any doubt of the ability of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead to take charge of the destiny of both the physical and the social world. But we need not stop here to prove the divinity of this double historic sign and narrative. It is enough to stand by the tangible results of the world comprehensive influence of the same. Two events like those which our one sign represents were altogether likely to be soon forgotten; Jonah was but an obscure Hebrew prophet and Jesus was born in a stable and lived a comparatively obscure life which ended with the ignominy of the cross. But they have not been forgotten. Incredible as it may seem the world has been revolutionized by the Christologic contents of the sign. There is to-day no civilization, no enlightenment, not a single triumph of humane and elevating principle in the world that is not due to the humiliation and exaltation of the incarnate Son of God. It is the nations who believe in Him who are leading humanity to higher levels of freedom and knowledge, to purity of thought and heroism of action, and they do these things by virtue of their faith in Him. Business and pleasure and trade and empires have come and gone, like the snow melted away; but Jesus has not only been the same yesterday and to-day—He has marvelously increased in power and dominion as the one divine-human universal world Helper. Is it not reasonable, therefore, to hold and insist that no other sign shall ever take the place of the one which our Lord has set up as the perpetual testimony of His life on earth, of His sufferings and death for the sin of the world, and of His glorious resurrection and ascension as the generic mediatorial Head of our fallen race?

It is solemnly significant that the much vaunted Oriental mythologic incarnations have done nothing for the economic social and material advancement of their numerous votaries during the nineteen centuries of our era. During all this time

the Indo-Germanic tribes, as all the Pagan masses elsewhere, were firmly held in the iron grasp of a stupid idolatry. Sacred elephants, and cows, and monkeys, were generously cared for, while unfortunate suffering men and women, and helpless children, were exposed and allowed to perish without mercy. Womanhood and widowhood remained firmly bound to a hopeless level of social degradation. Society was held to absolute caste division which nature abhors and Christian public opinion repudiates as the very quintessence of ignorance and of meanness combined. Thus Asiatic tribes were kept at a dead standstill. Not a single one of their many cruel ancient barbaric notions and savageries did they give up until they were compelled to do so by the strong arm of western nations. There was no growth in this Pagan economy for the individual or society in dignity and freedom. All ran from one generation to another, on the same fixed monotonous level. Not so in Europe where the evangel of the God-man prevailed and became the dominating force of popular culture. Here the tribes and people were as barbarous and as cruel as in central Asia, but they were not held down to their barbarisms as the ages rolled on. At the coming in of the Christologic evangel a conflict began which lifted up the individual and emancipated the race. Hence barbarisms were rooted up and rooted out, and society assumed a new face and a new character. This is a singular historical coincidence if the incarnations of divinity were all alike fictitious in the Pagan and the Christian world. It will be a little hard to account, in a satisfactory way, for this stupendous difference of ethic personal and economic results on the basis of isothermal lines, climatic or local influences, and the data of evolutionary theories.

In view of the past and the present, modern Christendom can do no otherwise than stand firmly and calmly by the Christocentric significance of the one sign of the prophet Jonas. It was and is and shall be the infallible divine guarantee of progress and freedom, of safety and peace. It carries with it a perpetual motive to individual exertion and social co-operation.

What by its evangelic influence and culture cannot be reached or realized by one generation may surely be accomplished by the generations which come after. It is a live process of a live historic world force which moves and develops by degrees and is sure to reach its aims as it proceeds. It does not confront the world only as a token of primal authority and power, the central position and force of which in history can neither be denied or evaded ; but it is a token and divine warrant at the same time of intensive Christologic growth to the church itself, and to society as moulded by the church. Hence the church rises to higher and broader conceptions of evangelic orthodoxy and biblical truths, and takes a wider range in the enforcement of the maxims, precepts and dogmas of the Christian faith as the cycles of historical development run their beneficent and majestic rounds.

And if the signs of the times are not altogether at fault or we fail to discern them, the unification of all the historical forces under the sun is going forward with marked momentum. The civil powers are in line and must co-operate for international peace and safety. Theology and the church are going back to Apostolic ecumenical simplicity and in that way will come to ecclesiastical unity and power. And in the face of these master forces secular science will readily learn to second and support the ruling temper of the higher powers. Our one sign, the sign of the prophet Jonas and of our Lord, stands for all this. It has stood, it stands in full meridian glory in this age of the triumph of modern civilization, and shall it not stand in world-comprehensive breadth and power when the millennial peace and harmony of the whole human race shall at last be a tangible reality ?

VII.

A CHAPTER ON THE BEGINNINGS OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

Introductory.—During the preparation of a recent work on “Recollections of College Life at Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa.,” we found that we had collected together a considerable amount of matter pertaining to the early history of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, for which there was not sufficient room in the work referred to. Under these circumstances, it occurred to us that it would be better to reserve the material, which had then come into our hands and publish the results of our investigations in another place, whilst they were still fresh in our recollection. At the present day this early history of the Seminary seems to be comparatively little understood, or at best rather dimly apprehended. To many persons it is somewhat of a dark region, a terra incognita, in our history as a denomination, which it might be just as well to leave uncovered, or allow to rest where it is. It is, however, not without interest, and as illustrating the finger of Providence in shaping events during periods of trial and tribulations in the history of the Church, it seems to us that it may be made profitable in the way of instruction and encouragement for future work and effort. Hoping, therefore, that it may thus serve a useful purpose, we proceed to put on record in this place some account of these beginnings of the Seminary, extending over a period of denominational life, which is now every day becoming dimmer as it recedes

from view amidst the shadows of the past. What we thus here try to reproduce we wish to be regarded as a contribution to Seminary history, on the one hand, as well as an addendum to the volume on College history just referred to, on the other.

An Appeal for Help.—During its early history the German Reformed Church in the United States, as is well known, was for the most part supplied with ministers by the Reformed Church of Holland, under whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction it then stood. Its main supply came from this source, and for the time being such an arrangement was the best that could be devised; because, the church authorities in Europe were careful not to endorse or recommend any persons as missionaries or pastors for the foreign field in America, except such as were well qualified for their work, both intellectually and morally. But in the course of time it began to be felt that a theological school was needed on this side of the ocean, in which young men reared in the Church here, and to the manor born, might be trained with great advantage for service in their own American churches. As early, accordingly, as the year 1785, the Reformed Coetus or Synod, in Pennsylvania, asked permission of the Synods of North and South Holland, interested in Pennsylvania affairs, to establish a High School or Seminary in this country; but the reverend fathers in Holland did not feel prepared to give such a weighty measure their approbation, mainly as they said, because they were not able to give it the necessary pecuniary assistance. A similar request was made in the following year and the reply was the same. It was unfortunate that the Holland brethren were not in a condition to make a more favorable response to this appeal. Had they at that time given encouragement to such a movement, a beginning might have been made, which, if only feeble at first, might have grown, and by its own energy sustained itself.

Experience has shown that missionary fields generally cannot dispense with schools and seminaries of learning, and that the permanence and success of the work in foreign lands depend largely on such institutions. So it was with

the missionary plant among the Germans in this country during the last century : whilst it was watered by the mother Church in Holland, it needed a school for the young prophets, to inspire confidence and hope for the future. It required a new centre of life.

A State of Orphanage.—In the year 1792 the Coetus, as it was accustomed to do, sent its annual proceedings to Holland for revision ; but as no answer was returned in the way of approval or disapproval, the connection between the mother and the daughter church came to an end, apparently of itself, without any formal act or alienation on either side, as far as may be inferred from existing documents.

In consequence of this separation the American Church was thrown upon its own resources, and left to provide for its own wants. In the natural course of events this condition of things was what might be expected to follow ; and in the end it was no doubt all for the best ; but for a considerable period of time the foster child remained in a state bordering on orphanage. It did the best that it could to supply its congregations with ministers of the Gospel : some came from the fatherland with good credentials, and some with none at all ; all, or nearly all, found places where they could preach, the bad as well as the good.

Self-Support.—But experience was a good teacher ; and a number of the older ministers received theological students into their families, and prepared them as well as they could for their future work. This method of supply continued for many years, and came to be regarded in the progress of time as the normal order of the Church's growth. But it did not satisfy its inner consciousness of what its wants required. This then began to be felt more and more as the years rolled around.

A Preparatory Step.—In the year 1817, the Synod at Yorktown, Pa. took action looking towards the establishment of a theological school of some kind, and appointed a committee to give the subject a careful consideration. At the same Synod a committee was appointed to prepare a short history of

the Church in this country, which concluded by directing the attention of the Synod to the necessity of having some institution of learning, in which shepherds might be prepared to take charge of the shepherdless flocks. The paper was prepared by Dr. Hendel. and refers in terms of commendation to the activity of the Dutch Reformed brethren in establishing such a school of learning, as an example to the German brethren, worthy of imitation.

In a Strait betwixt Two.—At the Synod of Carlisle, in 1818, a committee was appointed to confer with the delegates of the Dutch Reformed Church, then present at the Synod, in regard to forming a connection with their Seminary at New Brunswick, which, however, did not result in anything tangible. This was partly owing to the fact that, at the same time, negotiations were going on also with the Lutherans, looking towards a united Theological Institute for the two churches, in connection with the Franklin College at Lancaster. Committees had been appointed by both Synods, thoroughly to consider this weighty matter.

The Reformed Church stood then, as it does now, somewhere intermediate between the Dutch Reformed and Lutheran bodies; and a union with the one must tend to alienate it from the other, and to wound intimate historical associations. The Lutherans were just as tender and cordial as the Dutch towards their Reformed brethren, and the Synod must have felt at a loss to know which way to move. The result was that after earnest counsel and deliberation with both parties, nothing was done; and the German Reformed were left to stand by themselves in their own intermediate, historical position.

Almost a Union with the Lutherans.—As the two Evangelical Churches in Germany had just been united, in 1817, the feeling in this country became very strong that a similar union of the first two branches of the Reformation Church might be brought about here in this country also; the best men on both sides were earnestly interested in its favor; and at that time the theological tendencies, church life of the two par-

ties were, in many respects, favorable to the consummation of such a union. At that time it might have been effected, most likely, with good results. But it was ascertained when the movement seemed to be ripe for execution, that, whilst it met with favor among many of the best and most prominent ministers, there were those on both sides who demurred; and that, if the union had taken place, this latter class of persons would have stood aloof and formed ecclesiastical bodies of their own, thus increasing instead of diminishing the divisions of Zion. Abraham and Lot might have lived together peacefully; but the probability is that their herdsmen would have been constantly in danger of getting into strife.

A Remark.—The German Reformed Church at the present day stands substantially where it stood seventy years ago with reference to the Dutch and Lutheran brethren, somewhere between the two, historically; and it cannot turn to the one or the other without disturbing existing historical relations. If, however, the three bodies, Lutheran, Dutch, and German Reformed, could be brought together into one Evangelical Church, the difficulties would, as it seems to us, in a great degree vanish. This would be a strictly historical union, well arranged, well balanced, with a centre and two wings, right and left; and if once effected, which is perhaps impractical under existing circumstances, it might in the course of time lead other churches to unite with it in an old Reformation group of churches.

An End to Halting.—The unionistic movement for a Seminary for the Lutherans and Reformed extended into the Synod of Lancaster in 1819, when the joint committee of the two churches reported a Plan for a Union Seminary. The report was received and two hundred copies were ordered to be printed, so that every one might have time to consider this matter thoroughly, as its importance demanded. It was no doubt deeply and carefully studied, but that was the end of the matter. But the Reformed Church was waking up and preparing itself for a new departure. At this meeting a motion was carried to divide the Synod into Classes, a measure that was well calculated to

awaken new life, and to bring the Church into a better state of self-consciousness. The feeling became stronger that it would not do to halt any longer between two opinions; that the time had come when the Church should not easily or good naturedly lean on others, but for the future, take matters into its own hands and provide for its own wants.

Dr. Livingston.—To this Synod of Lancaster in 1819 the Rev. John Livingston, Professor of Theology of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick, N. J., presented one hundred and fifty copies of a pamphlet entitled "*An Address to the Reformed Churches in the United States*" He had prepared this document on his own responsibility and published it at his own expense in Philadelphia, for the benefit of the German Church. The object of the pamphlet was to show the necessity and usefulness of theological seminaries, and to encourage his German brethren to establish such an institution for themselves. It is written from a liberal standpoint, and breathes throughout a truly Christian spirit. He had probably at one time thought that one seminary would be sufficient to meet the wants of both churches, and no doubt favored the proposition of a union with the Seminary at New Brunswick, where our young men might go to receive their theological training. But he doubtless saw that the plan was not desirable, even if it were practicable. He therefore wisely gave it as his paternal advice to the German brethren to rise up and provide for themselves heralds of the Cross in their own way, to proclaim the Gospel in destitute places, some of which were not far from him in his own and the neighboring State of New York.

The Address was kindly received, and the thanks of the Synod were extended to the venerable professor for his disinterested kindness and goodwill. The copies were distributed among the members of the Synod, and for the following year they doubtless served as a good leaven, and in some degree helped to prepare the minds of the brethren for the next Synod. Copies of the Address may occasionally still be met with, bound up in old copies of the Minutes of the Synod.

The Election of a Professor.—The next Synod, which met at Hagerstown, Md., in 1820, was a delegate body, consisting of thirteen ministers and eleven elders. It was small in numbers, but it was composed of earnest men who had assembled themselves to do their duty. The probability is that they knew what they were going to do before they came together, and had already received the promise of ample support from certain liberal members of the Church in Maryland, in case they should go forward and establish a Seminary at once. So tradition informs us.

Accordingly the Synod went to work, adopted the Plan of the future Seminary, elected the Rev. Dr. Philip Milledoler, pastor of a Dutch Reformed congregation in New York City, as theological professor and fixed his salary at \$2,000. Its location was not defined, but was left to the wisdom and discretion of the College of Directors. It was no doubt understood that Fredericktown in Maryland was to be the place, because there were liberal men there such as Judge Shriver and others, who were deeply interested in this as well as all other movements that looked to the advancement of the Church. It was, however, thought best, as Mr. Reily said, to leave the location of the institution an open question for a while, as it might help to excite competition at Frederick, and thus rule out some other places, that might wish to be taken into consideration.

Great Enthusiasm.—This action of the Synod was adopted with much unanimity of feeling, and, as we are told, with no small amount of enthusiasm. The Synod had apparently at least, *done* something, and the day for thinking, conferring, consulting, now seemed to have passed away. The congregation at Hagerstown, then under the pastorship of such a pastor as Mr. Reily, was in full sympathy with such a movement as a matter of course, and the same was no doubt the case with that community, and with the churches generally in the State of Maryland. Dr. Milledoler was himself present as the delegate of the Dutch Church, and of course strengthened the confidence reposed in him. Under the impression that the Rubicon had been

passed, and that the long talked of Seminary would now soon go into operation, the Synod adopted a resolution forbidding all ministers to receive young men under their care for the purpose of instructing them in theology, permitting them only to direct them in the more elementary branches of study. This was intended for the benefit of the private theological schools in Eastern Pennsylvania, which had done a good work in their day, and were much needed still, at least until a Seminary should come into actual existence. The largest of these was under the care of Dr. Herman, who was well qualified for work of this kind. This wholesale condemnation of these schools, therefore, was not calculated to conciliate the good will and support of the German or eastern part of the Church.

A Defective Plan.—Besides, the Plan of the Seminary, very good as far as it went, said nothing about its internal character, whether it was to be English or German, or how. This was the vexed question of the day, which must be categorically answered, before any progress could be made. The impression pretty generally was, that it was to be a predominantly English institution, and mostly under English auspices. Whilst therefore the action of the Hagerstown Synod was dictated by the best and purest motives, it is evident that the reverend brethren did not take in the full situation: in other words, that they had counted without consulting their host, as the sequel showed.

A Sleeping Giant.—But there was a sleeping giant somewhere up in Pennsylvania that had some ideas of his own about a Seminary, which it required time for him to bring to a proper expression. The action of the Synod at Hagerstown, although it failed in the end, helped to arouse him from his slumbers, at least, and to set him to work to clear up his thoughts, so that he might be able to say what he wished to say, at the proper time.

A Vigorous Protest.—Dr. Milledoler was now before the Church as the candidate-elect; but whilst his friends strained every nerve to secure his services, dissatisfaction with the action of Synod continued to increase. Dr. Herman and others were

opposed to the location of the new institution, which had been fixed at Frederick. It was too far from the centre of the Church. Other objections were urged, some of which were entitled to consideration, and others to none at all. The real and greatest difficulty, underlying all other difficulties and objections, was the antagonism of language, which had to be reconciled before any advance could be made in any direction; and there was right as well as wrong on both sides, in what was coming to be a burning controversy.

It is a superficial view of the history of this period to suppose that the Germans were all wrong in the tenacity with which they clung to their mother tongue. A change of language at that time involved a surrendry of much that was precious and valuable, that could be expressed only in the old language. Their tenacity, therefore, in this direction, which seemed unreasonable and even stupid at the time, in the end exerted a salutary influence in the Church in general in giving it that Anglo-German character, which it possesses at present; and which it most probably would not now possess, if it had not been for the vigorous protest against the proceedings at Hagerstown, and their logical result, to wit, the ascendancy of English tendencies and counsels in the Church

A General Convention at Reading.—The dissatisfaction increased to such an extent, in the eastern part of the State, that, Mr. S. Helfenstein, president of the Synod, felt himself compelled to yield to the outside pressure, and in the summer of 1821, to call a Convention instead of the regular Synod, for which delegates had already been appointed by the Classes, which all ministers could attend, and where each could say what he had to say. This Synod was an exceedingly important one. It settled in principle the disputed question of language in a straight forward, honorable and intelligent manner, and took the first step towards establishing the Anglo-German character of the Church and her institutions from that time onward, down to the present time. The action here adopted was principial, and carried in it the force of a living potentiality.

The Mind of the Church—In harmony with the figure just introduced, the situation can be best described by saying, that by the time the Convention came together the giant referred to was fully aroused. His thoughts at first were somewhat confused, and his language incoherent. According to tradition, and public records also, some of his children, who were rather uncouth, and had not gone much to school or college, allowed themselves a wide range in the manner they exercised their freedom of speech. As private individuals, true to their want of a better training, they must have foamed and frothed, grumbled and growled, snapped and snarled, scolded and threatened in fearful language, talking loudly but not wisely. When, however, the giant himself sat down on the floor of Synod, and had time to come to himself and to gather up his thoughts assisted by the Rev. J. R. Reily—one of his own children—he expressed himself in remarkably clear, forcible and rational language. His mouth-piece was another of his sons, the Rev. Jacob Christian Becker, an eloquent preacher, and a level-headed, learned man; a teacher of theology, and afterwards a Doctor of Divinity. We here put on record the resolution which he formulated, that gave peace, in some degree to the Church, and prevented a secession from the Synod that would have been more dangerous and destructive than the one that occurred soon afterwards, among a few of the giant's own children.

Resolved, That Dr. Milledoler be required to give instruction both in the German and the English Languages; that he shall either deliver lectures, or place in the hands of his *studiosi* such German or English text-books as may be approved of by the Reverend Synod; and that his remarks and explanations shall be made in the German or English language, according as the wants of the students may require, who shall then be examined to ascertain whether they understand what they are taught.

This resolution was unanimously adopted. It gave a clear expression of the mind of the Church, and of the German portion of it in particular, notwithstanding the free talk and wild

fumings of individuals previous to their being called on to discharge the solemn duty of casting their vote at Synod. Had a resolution of this kind been adopted by the Synod of Hagerstown, it would most likely have saved much trouble, together with many heart-burnings, and cleared up the ecclesiastical sky considerably. But it was best that it should come to an expression at Reading, in the heart of the German population itself.

Dr. Milledoler.—Dr. Milledoler was a man of tender conscience, anxious to obey what he conceived to be the divine will in the case. The call to labor in the Church of his fathers occupied his attention for over a year, and no doubt gave him many conflicts and much searching of heart. At length he accepted of the appointment, and then afterwards felt compelled, by the force of circumstances, to recall his acceptance.

Dr. Mayer's Letters.—The history of this period of suspense and uncertainty is full of interest, has not been written out, as far as we know, in its details, nor perhaps been properly understood or appreciated. We therefore furnish our readers some original documents, never published before, which throw light upon the history of the times, as well as upon the motives and characters of those who were prominent in this first effort to establish a Seminary. They reflect credit upon the writer as well as Dr. Milledoler, both of whom have been misrepresented or misunderstood. They consist of letters from Dr. Mayer to his friend and former parishioner, B. C. Wolff, Esq., of Virginia. They were found among the papers of the late Dr. Wolff, carefully preserved; and we here give them to the public, without feeling that there is need of any special apology for their publication in this place.

I

York, Pa., Feb. 15, 1821.

Mr. B. C. Wolff, Esq:—

My Dear Friend and Brother,—A dark cloud hangs over us, Dr. Milledoler having resigned his appointment on account of the opposition made by his congregation. His resignation was so unexpected, and his reasons for it seem so insufficient that

he has lost some of the confidence reposed in him; so much so, that it was with much difficulty that we succeeded in getting up a resolution to remonstrate against his resignation, and again to solicit his acceptance of the call of the Synod. I have but faint hopes of success in this measure. But the Seminary cannot, and must not, be abandoned. If we ultimately fail in our application to Dr. Milledoler, we must select a professor from among ourselves; and whatever man the Synod may appoint, if there be any prospect of benefiting the church by his services, he shall have my decided and firm support. If we have a Seminary at all, we may hope to have an able professor sometime hereafter, and the Church will be in a course of improvement; whereas if we abandon it now, we are undone forever. We have come to a crisis, where the most zealous and disinterested exertions are indispensable, and where I pray God to give to each of my brethren and to myself a large measure of His grace.

We have located the Seminary at Fredericktown, from which place we are to receive \$12,000, now subscribed, and the unascertained amount of fifteen subscriptions in the hands of prominent men in different parts of the country, together with the contributions of Hagerstown, estimated at \$2,000 or \$3,000. I may be able to raise \$1,000 here, but have done nothing in that way yet, as the people are quite unprepared for it. Mr. Ebaugh was authorized to offer us about \$14,000, if Dr. Milledoler had accepted the professorship. When his resignation became known, no proposals were made from Carlisle, and all competition ceased, except a show by Mr. Reily, which was kept up only to elicit offers from Frederick.

Yours in the Lord,

Lewis Mayer.

II

York, March 26, 1821.

Mr. B. C. Wolff, Esq.—Dr. Milledoler has just left my house on his return from Washington, where he had been in conference with the Government on missionary business, as agent of the United Foreign Missionary Society. At my re-

quest he visited Frederick and conferred with the gentlemen whom we appointed a committee of managers in that place, on the subject of the Theological Seminary. The result of the conference was that they requested him to suspend his decision until he could hear from them, and that they resolved to do something handsome. I had much discussion with him on the difficulties in the way of his acceptance of our call, and ascertained that if his salary is secured, and we charge ourselves with the expense of his removal, and leave him to the exercise of his own judgment in the mode of instruction in the Seminary, he will make an effort to separate himself from his congregation, without whose consent he is not permitted to leave, and Dr. Livingston, with others, will plead our cause before them. The result in that case cannot fail to be favorable. Dr. Livingston is the father of the Dutch Reformed Church, and is among our people somewhat like Paul among the Gentile converts.

Our affairs, therefore, are in rather a better train than they have ever been. On the subject of the mode of instruction everything can be made satisfactory. The only difficulty lies in the ways and means. To raise money will require exertion. Every nerve will have to be strained to raise money for current expenses. Dr. M. informs me that Col. Rutgers, of New York, will give us a handsome donation if he becomes our professor. The people of my charge are beginning to open their eyes, but they do not yet see or feel as I wish. In my appeals to them I make mention of my late congregations in Virginia, of whom I need not be ashamed before any others. I hope the societies formed among you will not grow weary. They have the honor of beginning that work, which promises to be the glory of our church and a blessing to our land. The eyes of many who are remote from us are fixed on us, and some of the greatest and best among the friends of religion in the East and North are viewing our measures with much interest and affection. Go on, my dear friend, in the work of God. We must not, cannot fail.—

Lewis Mayer.

III

York, June 25, 1821.

Mr. B. C. Wolff, Esq.—I returned to this place from the northward on Saturday, after an absence of 27 days. When I left home the prospect before us was gloomy. A storm was gathering in the East among the German brethren, and threatening to burst upon us with destructive effect. They had a meeting at Kutztown, organized an opposition, issued a printed Circular, inviting their brethren to join them, appointed a committee of three to meet our Board at Philadelphia (the Board of Directors of the Seminary, now called the Board of Visitors, Ed.) to protest against the measures of Synod and our proceedings in relation to the Seminary, *and recommended the calling of a professor from Germany* (the Italics are ours—Ed.).

Dr. Milledoler was somehow apprised of all these measures, and the effect would have put an end to our hopes, but for that kind Providence which has watched over us, and taketh the wise in their own craftiness. We received the German committee politely, heard their objections, answered their argument and then took our ground, which we were determined to maintain. We exhibited a view of the churches, on the western side of the Susquehanna, their numbers, wealth, liberality in support of the Seminary, the prevalence of the English language among them, their attachment to Dr. Milledoler, their determination to support no other in the professorship, and the disastrous consequences which would result to our Seminary from his declination, if he were compelled to decline the call of the Synod; and we assured them that if our measures were defeated, both our congregations and we would secede from the German Church and go over to the Dutch Reformed.

These representations were at first but little regarded, but the firmness of the Board at length shook the resolution of the Committee, and after several consultations among themselves, they abandoned their project, and we parted as brethren affectionately. The committee were pastors Wack, Sr., Vandersloot, and Dechant.

An inquiry into our finances produced the following results: In the treasury, \$3,000; subscribers at Frederick, Md., will pay immediately \$6,000; at Hagerstown, according to Mr. Reily, \$2,000; at Carlisle, according to Mr. Ebaugh, \$1,000; and at York, at least \$500. From other places no estimate was laid before us. These sums will yield annually \$750. In addition to this resource, Rev. John Winebrenner engages to pay annually \$200; Rev. Jonathan Helfenstein, \$100; Rev. Albert Helfenstein, \$100; Rev. J. Reily, \$100; Rev. J. S. Ebaugh, \$100; myself, \$100. What will be farther needed for professor's and incidental expenses, will have to be collected from other sources. Colonel Rutgers, of New York, promised me to pay \$1,000 on demand, and to give whatever God may enable him to spare. He is a noble-minded man, who spends a large amount of his income in pious purposes.

But you will ask me what becomes of Dr. Milledoler. My dear Friend, the long agony is over—our cause has prevailed under the guidance of that Providence in which we trusted. Dr. Milledoler accepts our call, with, however, the reservation that if our finances should not by next meeting of Synod be in a condition to secure his salary, he may withdraw his consent. We had several long conferences before we went to Albany, and were informed that he would decide the question by the time of our return to New York.

On our return we spent two days with him. His mind seemed to be much agitated,—in a conflict between a sense of duty on the one side and an apprehension of danger on the other. He could not refuse our application, because their appeared in it so much of the finger of God. He could not resolve to accept our call, because by that act he would relinquish a large amount of important and endearing interests in New York, subject himself to a series of new and arduous labors, incur a tremendous responsibility, perhaps be ill-paid, and compelled at last to retire, pitied indeed, but not relieved. In his present situation a liberal provision would be made for him and his family, if age or disease should unfit him for service; but

what could the German Church do for him? These reflections had taken possession of his mind, and exhibiting the difficulties attending our call in this most formidable aspect disposed him strongly to retire from such a conflict.

In this state of mind he went to his family devotions on the evening before our departure. He reads every evening one of a series of devout meditations for every day in the year. It was the 15th of June, and the meditation for that day happened to be on the words of Nehemiah, "Should such a man as I flee?" When he had read these words, he paused, examined the date, and having ascertained its correctness, proceeded. The meditation was appropriate. He paused again and again, his mind being deeply impressed. At the close of the lesson he remarked upon the strangeness of the coincidence, and seemed to regard it as an answer from heaven to his frequent and fervent supplication for divine direction, and in the morning he informed us that he considered it his duty to accept our call. Tell me was not the hand of God in all this? Our Seminary will be opened about the first of April, 1822. Great exertions to obtain funds are necessary, and in these you must have your part.—

Lewis Mayer.

IV

York, Oct. 16, 1821.

Mr. Bernard C. Wolff, Esqr.—I presume you have information of the calling of a General Convention of our ecclesiastical body by Mr. Samuel Helfenstein, the late President of the Synod. The object of that call appeared to me to be to effect the withdrawal of Dr. Milledoler, a change in the location of the Seminary, and an alteration of its Plan. The call was made at so late a period, and so unexpectedly, that many of the brethren who reside at great distances could not attend; and it was manifestly so irregular, and unconstitutional, that some who attended brought no lay deputies with them. The party in opposition were an overwhelming majority. Some of our friends had abandoned us, and gone over to the other side. Among them were ——— and ———. A storm was gathering. The

elements lowered with blackness and commotion, and instantaneous ruin seemed to await us. We took our stand and prepared ourselves for the shock, trusting in Him who dwells above the whirlwind and directs the storm, resolved to make a last effort for the safety of the Church, and to bend in submission, if God had determined to destroy it. When this conflict began the force against us was fearfully overpowering, and at one time all appeared to be lost. But in the midst of the thickening darkness, when our overthrow seemed already accomplished, in a sudden all opposition ceased, the warring elements were hushed into silence, and every part of our plan remained unhurt.

The location of the Seminary, the appointment of Dr. Milledoler, the delivering of lectures in both the English and German languages, were unanimously approved. A committee was appointed to revise and amend the Plan of the Seminary with instructions to submit their amendment to the several Classes, and to the Synod at their next meeting, the committee consisting of Jonathan Helfenstein, J. R. Reily and L. L. Hinsch. A perfect cordiality now prevails, and the German brethren have generally pledged themselves to support the Seminary with all their influence.

You will of course inquire how this change was effected. My dear Friend, we were the instruments, but God was the agent. When the brethren met to organize their body, we demanded that the constitutional meeting of the ordinary Synod should be first held, and that the legality of the call for a Convention should be first investigated by that body. This demand was violently opposed. I had prepared a critical investigation of this subject, which with some difficulty I was permitted to read. No reply was made to my arguments, but during the reading I was insulted by the sneers and contemptuous gestures of those for whom it is an easier task to laugh than to reason; and when the question was put we were put down by main force.

I now declared my determination to enter my protest on the

minutes; and seeing that our opponents were resolved to carry their point at all hazards, we began to commune seriously about a separation from them, and a connection with the Dutch Reformed Church. We made no secret of our intentions, but they were little regarded. One thing, however, was certain, namely, that if Dr. Milledoler were removed, all our funds would be lost, and together with them, the affections of our liberal congregations and most active ministry. Our opponents now brought forward a plan or scheme, which seemed well calculated to throw the odium of such a loss upon ourselves. Three resolutions were proposed, namely: That the location of the Seminary at Frederick should be approved; that Dr. Milledoler be approved as the professor, provided he would pledge himself to lecture in German; and that a committee be appointed to revise and amend the Plan of the Seminary. Nothing was said about English lectures, or a permission to put into the hands of the students German and English text-books instead of formal lectures. It was well-known that Dr. Milledoler would not accept the professorship of a merely German Seminary; but to superficial observers the resolutions appeared liberal and conciliatory; and if in consequence of their adoption the Doctor should withdraw and the funds be lost, he and his friends would incur the odium, whilst his opponents would be honored for their liberality.

Mr. Reily spoke against the second resolution, and in favor of the first in an impressive speech, which was heard with deep silence and drew tears from several of the audience. He seemed to be on this occasion a chosen instrument of God. After he had concluded, the second resolution was altered so as to read, "provided he will lecture in German and English." To this we would have assented, but before the question could be taken an adjournment was moved and carried. On the next morning our opponents took higher ground, having again altered their resolution so as to read, "provided that he will lecture principally in German and occasionally in English." In this form we opposed it with all our might. Messrs. ———

————— and others now entered the lists against us, and the debate was continued until the feelings of several were wrought up to a high state of exasperation.

During this debate Mr. ———— insulted one of the Dutch Reformed delegates, and afterward myself also, in a very gross manner. He received a little chastisement for it in Synod, and provoked a very general expression of disapprobation from the audience. He left Reading on the next morning. It was well. Fatigued with fruitless and ignorant debates, we remained silent. The question was taken on the resolution, and carried, 45 against 20. Knowing that Dr. Milledoler would not accept the professorship if this resolution remained as it was, that the funds would be lost, and the Seminary be destroyed, the minority authorized Mr. Reily to inform the Synod in the afternoon session that, if the resolutions adopted in the morning were not rescinded, we had no alternative but to secede from the Church. He performed this duty in a short and solemn address to the chair, and then invited the minority to meet at his lodgings in the evening for the purpose of devising ulterior measures. When he closed all were silent. The members looked one at another and many a countenance indicated alarm or embarrassment. There was evidently a conflict between the pride of opinion and a sense of danger. He said no more; but He, who turns the hearts of men like the waterbrook, was now performing His work. After a short pause, it was proposed by one of the majority to rescind the obnoxious resolutions and adopt another requiring the professor "to give instructions in the German and English languages, either by formal lectures or by putting text-books into the hands of the students and examining them upon these books." This proposition was universally approved, and the new resolution unanimously adopted.

Thus we obtained more than we had at first requested, and all that we could have desired. To quiet the fears of our German brethren, we offered a resolution requiring that every student in the Seminary should be able to speak the German lan-

guage correctly before he could be admitted into the ministry of our Church. This conciliatory measure, which does not affect students of other denominations, was adopted and produced much cordiality. Two members of the opposition now distinguished themselves by proposing and supporting measures to promote the interests of the Seminary.

After these transactions Mr. S. Heffenstein offered a resolution explanatory of the powers of the president, by which this officer is forever precluded from calling a Convention, and that power is vested in the Synod only. In consequence of the adoption of this resolution, I declined inserting my protest against the irregular call, because it had now become unnecessary, and if it were even inserted it might interrupt the existing harmony.

Thus you can see our victory is complete, but let all the glory be given to Him, who achieved it for us. Our funds amount to \$16,000, secured though not yet paid, and about \$13,000 conditionally promised, but not secured. I am pledged to pay \$500, and to raise by subscription \$500 for the permanent fund, and to raise by collection annually \$100 for the current expenses.—

Lewis Mayer.

V

York, December 12, 1821.

Mr. B. C. Wolff, Esqr.—I have just time to inform you that I received a letter from Dr. Milledoler yesterday communicating the intelligence that he has finally determined to accept our call to the professorship, and has obtained the unanimous consent of his consistory. The great question is now at rest; but now the most sacred obligations lie upon us to support him with all our strength; every nerve must be strained to get a capital together as soon as possible. The Doctor gives up an income of between \$3,000 and \$4,000, leaves his property, has two married daughters, and a large circle of most amiable and devoted friends.—

Lewis Mayer.

VI

York, Feb. 21, 1822.

Mr. B. C. Wolff, Esqr.— * * * * I attended a meeting of the Board of Superintendents of the Seminary at Baltimore last week. The second Sunday in June is appointed for the inauguration of Dr. Milledoler. Rev. Samuel Heffenstein, of Philadelphia, will preach in German in the morning, and I in English in the afternoon. Dr. Milledoler will then deliver his inaugural address. Rev. William Hendel, of Womelsdorf, will give the charge, and Rev. Albert Helfenstein will conclude with prayer.

The text-books are : in Didactic and Polemical Theology, Stapfer's *Grundlegung der Christlichen Religion* in 12 vols. 8 vo.; in Latin for English class, in German for the German ; in Ecclesiastical History, Mosheim's *Church History*, in English and German ; in Sacred Literature, Michaelis's *Introduction to the New Testament* in the English and German for the present, or until another work can be had in both languages. In the other branches of study no text-books have been selected. Enough might be had in one or the other of the two languages, but we must have the same work in both. To make a good selection is a work of more difficulty than I had imagined, and the difficulty is much increased by the peculiar construction of our Seminary.

I had written on this subject to Dr. Moses Stuart, of Andover, and to Dr. Miller, of Princeton. The former gentleman replied that he could tell me nothing, and inviting me to Andover, that I might see their studies, libraries, etc. The latter answered in a very condescending and affectionate style, but was unable to recommend any German works. His letter is replete with interesting and valuable information on the general subject of theological studies. I had also consulted Dr. Wilson, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Milledoler. Dr. Wilson's reply was limited to one point only in didactic and polemic divinity, and contained some valuable hints on that subject. Dr.

Milledoler communicated nothing of much value or interest. Having been employed in preaching, he has applied the whole energy of his mind to that one exercise, and is not at present qualified to give much information respecting books or studies which lie out of his path. Of the text-books a number of copies are wanted, Lexicons, Grammars, Concordances, Commentaries, Hebrew Bibles, Greek Testaments, especially critical editions. With these we ought to have the whole works of the best writers in English, German and Latin.—

Lewis Mayer.

VII

York, May 21, 1822.

Mr. B. C. Wolff, Esqr.—Dr. Milledoler's resignation was the result of a train of causes which would require more time than I can spare, and need more room than a letter affords to explain. There were many considerations for and against his acceptance of a call, which seemed to be equally balanced in his own mind; and a matter which might be of no great intrinsic importance, might, therefore, turn the scale on one side or the other. This state of things was the cause of Dr. Milledoler's vacillations; and its effects were increased by what seemed to me an infelicity in his character, a want of firmness. The Doctor is not formed for enterprise. His talents and habits are formed for the pulpit, where he shines with a beautiful lustre; but he seems to be much less qualified for any other employment. These were my opinions formed before his late resignation, and I therefore ceased to urge his acceptance of our call with my former importunity.

The consistory of the Dutch Reformed Church, in New York, had in December passed a resolution dissolving the Doctor's pastoral connection with them, "if he requested it." Upon this he wrote to me and others signifying his acceptance, and authorizing such a use of the information as the President of Synod might think proper, adding that nothing remained but to obtain the consent of the Classis of New York. In February the consistory appointed a committee to investigate the circumstances

of our call. The committee reported on the 28th of the same month, and their report was adopted and a copy of their report was transmitted to me, with a letter of condolence by the President of the Consistory, the Rev. Mr. Knox. The report represents that the German Church has been, and will probably be, in a disturbed state on account of English lectures in the Seminary; that we have no funds to secure a regular payment of the professor's salary; that the call is not for life; that the Synod has not bound themselves and their successors; and that the Dutch congregation is utterly unwilling to surrender their pastor; and it concludes by recommending to Dr. Milledoler to continue in his present situation. They got over his letter of acceptance by pretending that it does not commit him to us, because there was some irregularity and precipitation in it, and in the proceedings which led to it.

Whilst these things were transacting, Dr. Milledoler wrote to me for information respecting our proceedings and prospects, stating that he has his misgivings, that discouraging reports have reached him, that his consistory, being changed by a recent election of new members, were opposed to his coming, etc., etc., etc., requesting me to communicate to him freely whatever might be interesting, and particularly desiring to learn whether any unpleasantness had taken place.

At this time information had reached me of a new disturbance in the church, which wore a gloomy aspect. These commotions were made known to Dr. Milledoler agreeably to his own request freely, and his resignation immediately followed.

What we shall do I cannot tell. All agree that the Seminary must be established, but the difficulty is to get another professor. S. H. talks about another general Convention for the choice of a professor, not trusting, it seems, in any other body. Mr. Hinsch and others wish to get one from Germany, where it is said men of the finest talents and acquainted with the English language may be had. If all this be so, I shall rejoice in it, but I am afraid to buy a cat in a bag.—

Lewis Mayer.

The Free Synod.—The disturbances in the Church, of which Dr. Mayer speaks in his last letter, refer to the agitation in the German churches, which commenced after the election of Dr. Milledoler at Hagerstown in 1820, and resulted in the organization of what was called the "Free Synod," in the spring and fall of 1822. The General Convention at Reading, although its action was just and judicious, did not allay all excitement nor restore entire confidence. A few ministers, and a great many people, were in an inflammatory state of mind, suspicious of church authority and discipline, and apprehensive that the Synod was dangerous to their liberties. The discipline of a young minister for intemperance at Reading increased the excitement and brought it up to fever heat. In connection with this case of discipline, the action of the Synod at Hagerstown, deciding that it was contrary to the Scriptures for a minister to hold a secular office, aimed at one or more ministers, who were holding office in county houses, seemed to threaten radical efforts to purify the Church, and to foreshadow something of Calvinistic rigor in time to come. When therefore some five or six ministers, of whom Dr. Herman either became, or was made, leader, determined to secede and form an independent Reformed Synod, many people, not always of the best class, applauded them and became their staunch supporters. The excitement became intense, and commenced to spread in all directions. A full account of its history would fill a volume of interesting yet sad and melancholy incidents. It was a case in which many people imagined that they were in danger of losing some of their most precious rights,—of being brought under a galling tyranny. Ministers were suspected of some deep-laid plan to enslave the people; and suspected also just in proportion to their humility and fidelity to their calling. We here quote from one of Dr. Mayer's letters to show the state of feeling existing among a certain class of our German people.

A Violent Ferment.—"The mother Synod was denounced as a tyrannical hierarchy, composed of men who were intent on making themselves lords of the Church, binding the congrega-

tions in all cases, removing their preachers and giving them others at pleasure, taxing them in heavy contributions, &c. They had established a Seminary at Frederick, appointed an English professor with an enormous salary, \$2000, and had taken measures to obtain an act of incorporation, which would enable them to compel the congregations to support the institution. Thus the civil and religious liberties of the people were in danger and it was necessary that they should arise and assert their independence, and much more of the same kind of stuff. A violent ferment was produced and congregations, about forty of them, arose in every direction, and formally declared themselves free and independent, with a mass of sickening ignorance and pomp."—The Lutherans were here as active and perhaps nearly as bad as the Reformed in these popular movements.

Good and Bad.—From all this, and much more, it might be inferred that there could have been little or no Christianity at that time among the German people in the eastern part of this State—that all had bowed the knee to Baal. We have heard it stated that there were some congregations in which there was not a single true Christian. This we think is a mistake, and we regard the statement as quite too broad and wide of the mark. There were many pious Christians there, as well as elsewhere, as those of us know who had grandmothers, mothers, aunts, uncles and cousins in what was supposed to be a God-forsaken region, who without any noise continued to let their light shine, when the wicked worldly people around them rose up and imagined a vain thing.

The churches in Eastern Pennsylvania were badly constituted. The old order of things, as brought from Germany, still prevailed. Every one who paid for the support of the Church, whether he was a moral man or not, was regarded as a member, and such, whether they were communicants or not, were often quite forward in laying down the law for the Christian people, and the most prominent in their opposition to everything that savored of progress or spiritual advancement. They cared little or nothing about religion themselves, but were usually active and quite busy in church quarrels, in which they probably imagined

they were making up for their barrenness and want of interest in spiritual things. So alas, it has too often been the case in the Christian Church. The worldly element finding out that it is of some secular advantage to belong to the Church, make use of their opportunities, and use them for the purpose of promoting their own selfish ends. They have their axes to grind, and their bad pre-eminence gives a bad character to their churches, although they may be all the while in a small minority. And so it was in what has sometimes been wrongly called the "dark corner" of this State of Pennsylvania, sixty or seventy years ago. The worldly part of the people—the tares among the wheat—took matters into their own hands, attempted to speak and act for the churches and grossly misrepresented them. If *all* had had a chance to vote, they would have been put down by an overwhelming majority.—These remarks also apply to the Lutherans.

It was largely from this sort of persons, encouraged by a low class of lawyers and politicians, that the ranks of opposition to the Synod—to priestcraft or *Pfafferei* as it was called—were replenished. On the other hand, there were hundreds and thousands of good, pious Christian people—more than seven thousand of them—who never bowed their knee to the Berks County Baal, who prayed in secret, drew comfort and strength from their bibles and other books of devotion, and honored their Christian profession.

Dr. Milledoler withdraws.—These popular commotions among the German churches doubtless led Dr. Milledoler finally to decline the call to the professorship in the Seminary. All along it is evident that he was in doubts in regard to the path of duty. On the one side, his consistory, newly elected, was a barrier in his way; and on the other, the divided state of the German churches gave him no encouragement to hope for success in the new field to which he was called. In his state of mind a slight consideration—a mere feather—was sufficient to turn the scales. He doubtless acted wisely as well as conscientiously. Whilst his name would have been an inspiration to many good and true people in the Church, it is not likely that he would have been successful, in the circumstances, in rallying

around him the denomination as a whole. For a work of that kind he did not possess the necessary qualifications; and if he had been induced to make the effort, it would have most likely resulted in a failure, which would have been as painful to his friends as to himself.

* *After the Storm.*—But were these two years of effort to establish the Seminary and to secure a professor mere waste of energy, a dead loss of time? We think not. They were years of progress and preparation for the future, years of study, of reflection and prayer, for those who had the interests of Zion at heart. All was not lost when a particular man was not put into the theological chair, as Dr. Mayer feared. One sad disappointment only awakened new zeal for further efforts, and as Dr. Mayer said at the close of his last letter, "all were agreed that the Seminary must be established." The Hagerstown Synod did a brave thing—it started a movement which ended in a Seminary that has to this day met the wants of the Church. What greater credit could be given to a single, synodical meeting? It accomplished a great deal in arousing the Church, and in getting it to think—to induce it to awake from its slumbers.

Peace.—The Free Synod continued to live on from its first meeting in the fall of 1822, with its protest against imaginary evils, and increased in strength and numbers for a while; but in the course of time it began to see that its mission, whatever it was, was fulfilled and that its occupation was gone. It did great harm in its day, which has not perhaps all as yet passed away; but it would be far from us to say that it did no good. When it returned to the mother Synod in 1836 and 1837 with a filial spirit, it brought with it some of our best and most useful pastors, and with them their large congregations, which had not grown weaker under their spiritual care and supervision.

Good Fruits.—The difficulties, through which the Church passed during what we now regard as a dark and tempestuous period, were, as is now evident, intended for good. They had much—we might say, everything—to do in forming its distinctive character as an Anglo-German denomination in which its strength and its usefulness are mainly to be found.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THOUGHTS FOR THOUGHT: Discussions of Timely Topics. By William Frederick Faber. 1886. p. 155.

A series of seven vigorous discourses on Church and State; Divisions of American Christendom; The Coming Church; America's Hope and Mission; The Nation; The Family, and the Education of the Young—originally preached to his congregation, Westfield, N. Y., in 1885, and now published with slight changes.

The principal idea of the book is the organic unity of the Church with her glorified Head, Jesus Christ. Hence follows her total independence of the State. The two institutions, on account of their difference of nature and vocation, must fulfill their mission separately; and this separation of Church and State, the Rev. Mr. Faber maintains, should be total, as contemplated by the first amendment to our Federal Constitution.

He questions the propriety of the custom according to which the civil ruler appoints days of thanksgiving or of humiliation, seeing in it remains of the *union* of Church and State. His conception of the Church being organic and catholic, he unsparingly condemns the present divisions of evangelical Protestantism as unwarranted; anticipates a better unity of the coming Church; emphasizes faith in Christ and christian righteousness as the only hope of our land; and, whilst vindicating the common schools of the State, insists on the need of working out a system of church education.

A healthy and earnest tone of christian faith and christian devotion pulsates in all the veins of thought and inquiry. The negative aspect of treatment is prominent, but it is always complemented by clear and forcible affirmation and development of positive evangelical truth. We commend especially the sound views concerning the Church as the one living body of Christ, maintaining her unity and continuity by the presence and agency of His Holy Spirit. The family institution occupies its true place both in its relation to the national life and to the Christian Church.

On the difficult question concerning the relation of Church and State, the author, we think, may be constrained, after further earnest reflection, to revise some of his positions. The Church can live, and will live, independently of the patronage or even of the sympathy, of the State. But, as the civil economy is a moral organ-

ism and as correct ethical ideas are rooted in the religious life, from it deriving nourishment, motive and power, the vitality and prosperity of the State are dependent on those conditions which true religion alone supplies. The wholesome views developed by the discussion on the family in its relation to the Nation and to the Church, if consistently carried out and rigidly applied, would weaken the force of the plea for the total separation of Church and State.

Perhaps the word "freedom" might better express the relation. The Church, under our Constitution, is wholly free from the legislative authority of the State; but on all questions involving contracts she is subject to the judicial and executive power. By the law of our land, no religion can be established nor prohibited; and this includes organization, doctrine, government and worship. On the other hand, the State also is free from the legislative authority of the Church; but dependent continually on the vitalizing power of her spiritual teaching and her godly living. Whilst civil law and civil order are a condition of Church freedom, the spiritual life and christian holiness of the Church are the foundation of social order and civil righteousness.

There is a correlation between these two spheres; but the points of connection and separation present a problem which is still awaiting a satisfactory solution.

E. V. G.

SCIENTIFIC THEISM. By Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Ph. D. Second Edition, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1886. Price \$2.00.

This is a work of decided ability and it will amply repay careful reading on the part of all who are interested in the philosophic questions of the day. The author, like Plato and Aristotle, is a realist. He holds that an external universe exists in complete independence of human consciousness so far as its existence is concerned, and that this universe is not only knowable, but truly known in part though not in whole. His treatise is divided into two parts which are preceded by a somewhat lengthy Introduction. The Introduction, which takes up about one-fourth of the volume was originally published in the *London Mind* for October, 1882, with the title, "Scientific Philosophy: A Theory of Human Knowledge." In it the various systems of Philosophy are sharply criticised, and the author's own system set forth. Part I of the present treatise discusses the Philosophy of Science in three chapters which treat respectively of the presuppositions of the Scientific Method, the theory of phenomenism, and the theory of noumenism. In Part II the Religion of Science is considered. This part also consists of three chapters in which are discussed the principles of Scientific Theism, the question as to whether the universe is a machine or an organism, and the God of Science. The reader of this notice may gather the general elements of Dr. Abbot's Phil-

osophy from the following propositions in which he himself presents, in the closing chapter of the work before us, his conception of the universe.

"1. Because the universe is in some small measure actually known in human science, it must be in itself both absolutely self-existent and infinitely intelligible; that is, it must be a noumenon because it is a phenomenon.

2. Because it is infinitely intelligible, it must be likewise infinitely intelligent.

3. Because it is at the same time both infinitely intelligible and infinitely intelligent, it must be an infinite subject-object or self-conscious intellect.

4. Because it is an infinitely intelligible object, it must possess throughout an immanent relational constitution.

5. Because it possesses an infinitely intelligible relational constitution, it must be an absolutely perfect system.

6. Because it is an absolutely perfect system, it cannot be an infinite machine, but must be an infinite organism.

7. Because it is an infinite organism, its life-principle must be an infinite immanent Power, acting everywhere and always by organic means for organic ends, and subordinating every event to its own infinite life, in other words, it must be infinite Will directed by infinite Wisdom.

8. Because it is an infinite organism, its exient organic end disappears as such, but reappears as infinite Love of itself and infinite Love of the finite.

9. Because it is an infinite organism, its immanent organic end appears as the eternal realization of the Ideal, and therefore as infinite Holiness.

10. Because, as an infinite organism, it thus manifests infinite Wisdom, Power and Goodness, or thought, feeling and will in their infinite fullness, and because these three constitute the essential manifestations of personality, it must be conceived as Infinite Person, Absolute Spirit, Creative Source and Eternal Home of the derivative finite personalities which depend upon it, but are no less real than itself."

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION. Eight Lectures Preached before the University of Oxford in the year MDCCCLXXXV, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton. By Frederick W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster; Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Publishers and Importers, 31, West Twenty-third Street, 1886. Price \$3.50.

This volume Archdeacon Farrar does not give to the public as an exhaustive treatment of the history of Interpretation. In it he only deals with the chief epochs in the progress of Biblical Science,

and gives some account of those who caused the chief movements of fresh impulse to the methods of interpretation. Within the limits he has prescribed to himself he gives, however, a large amount of important and instructive information. The various subjects treated of are; The Success and Failure of Exegesis, Rabbinic Exegesis, Alexandrian Exegesis, Patristic Exegesis, Scholastic Exegesis, The Reformers, Post-Reformation Epoch, and Modern Exegesis. To each of these subjects an entire lecture is devoted. All the lectures, it is scarcely necessary to say, give evidence of superior scholarship, and are written in that attractive style which makes all of the author's works so readable. To the body of the work a considerable number of valuable notes and a Bibliography of General Exegesis are added. The main wish and object of the author throughout these lectures is to show the true basis whereon rests the sacredness of holy Scripture. The work will prove a valuable acquisition to any library, and we heartily commend it to all our readers.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES DELIVERED IN AMERICA. By Frederick W. Farrar, D.D., F. R. S., Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster. With an introduction by Phillips Brooks, D.D. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 31 West Twenty-third Street, 1886. Price \$2.00.

These sermons, addresses and lectures, were delivered by Canon Farrar, during his recent visit to Canada and the United States, and were highly appreciated by all who heard them. Those who did not enjoy the opportunity of hearing them will now, by means of this volume, be able to acquaint themselves with their contents, and they will find it well worth while so to do. The sermons are fourteen in number. They are all of a highly practical character, and abound in striking thoughts most eloquently expressed. No one can well read them without being both delighted and benefited. The addresses are four in number. The *first* treats of "Modern Education: Its Sphere and its Aims," and was delivered as an opening address at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. The *second* is on the "Christian Doctrine of the Atonement," and was read at the Church Congress in New Haven last fall, where also the *third* on the "Grounds of Christian Unity" was delivered. The *fourth* is a temperance address delivered at the Temperance Reception, Chickering Hall, New York, the latter part of October last. One of the lectures treats of Dante, and the other consists of "Farewell Thoughts on America." The same graces of style, and the same breadth and profundity of thought, that characterize the sermons are also marked features of the addresses and lectures. Those who take up the volume, we think, will hardly be willing to lay it permanently aside before they have read it through, and no one, we feel sure, will regret the purchase of it.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph

Parker, D.D. Volume III. *Leviticus*,—Numbers xxvi. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street, 1886. Price \$1.50.

The same features that characterize the earlier parts of this important work, which were noticed in the January and April numbers of this Review for the present year, characterize also the present portion of it. It is made up, in the same way as the volume on *Genesis* and that on *Exodus*, of discourses based on the contents of the Biblical Books named in the title-page, together with notes and "handfuls of purpose" for all gleaners. The discourses, like those in the volumes just named, are remarkable for the instruction which they impart, and the power and brilliancy of their style; and the "handfuls of purpose" are equally suggestive. Those who have the other volumes will, of course, desire this one also. For home reading the People's Bible is most admirably designed, and the careful perusal of its volumes cannot fail to prove beneficial. Its treatment of the Books of Holy Scripture is such as to throw much light upon them, and to awaken attention to the great truths which they contain.

PRaise-SONGS OF ISRAEL. A New Rendering of the Book of Psalms. New and Revised Edition. By John De Witt, D.D., of the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.; a member of the American Old Testament Revision Company. Funk & Wagnalls; New York, 10 and 12 Dey Street: London, 44 Fleet Street, 1886. Price \$1.50.

We called attention to the merits of this work shortly after the first edition appeared, in the Review for July, 1885. This new and revised edition is not, however, a mere reprint of the first edition. A considerable number of changes and corrections—over five hundred we believe—have been made, although the work remains substantially the same. The object of the changes has been to remove blemishes, and to bring out more distinctly the beauty, force and impressiveness of the original. The work has received high praise from many of the leading Biblical scholars both in this country and in Great Britain. It is generally acknowledged, by those most competent to express a judgment on the matter, to be the best rendering of the Book of Psalms to be found in the English language.

RECOLLECTIONS OF COLLEGE LIFE at Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., from 1839 to 1845. A Narrative, with Reflections. By Rev. Theodore Appel, D.D., Lancaster Pa. Reading, Pa.: Daniel Miller, Printer and Publisher. 1886. Price \$1.25.

This is an entertaining and instructive volume, and it should find a place in every Reformed family in the country. Though it modestly claims to be only recollections of college life, yet it is in reality much more. The author does not merely narrate what took place at Marshall College while he was a student there, but he gives at the same time the existing state of things throughout the Church, traces the causes that produced it, and points out the influences

then active in the way of moulding the Church's life. The work is therefore really a chapter in Church history. It portrays in a clear, accurate and exceedingly interesting manner the most important period as yet in the history of the Reformed Church in the United States. On this account the book will be found valuable not only to the members of this Church, but to all who would have a correct knowledge of its theological tendencies. For, though the Reformed Church has made marked progress in various ways since the days treated of in this volume, yet its present position cannot well be understood without a knowledge of those days and the forces then at work. There is not a dull chapter in the book, and all, without exception, convey important information; yet the chapters on Dr. Rauch's Aesthetics, Ethics and Philosophy, and those on Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff will be found especially instructive. As a mere literary production the volume also has decided merits. It is written in an unpretentious yet unusually attractive style, which makes it very pleasant as well as profitable reading. Dr. Appel deserves the thanks of the Reformed Church for writing this book and thus preserving important facts as well as giving her members an insight into the character of the formative period of her history, and especially of her literary institutions.

THE TREASURY OF DAVID: Containing an Original Exposition of the Book of Psalms; A Collection of Illustrative Extracts from the Whole Range of Literature; a Series of Homiletical Hints upon almost every Verse; and Lists of Writers upon each Psalm. By C. H. Spurgeon. Vol. vii. Psalm cxxv. to cl. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1886. Price \$2.00 per volume.

The "Treasury of David," which this volume completes, is one of the most extensive and valuable practical commentaries on the Book of Psalms to be found in any language. The character of the work is well set forth in the title-page. First, we have an original exposition of each psalm by the author of this commentary. The exposition is especially practical and devotional, and abounds in those characteristics of style and thought which make all of Mr. Spurgeon's writings so popular. Then come explanatory notes, gathered from the whole range of literature. In these notes we have given us the best thoughts of many different commentators and writers on the psalms. The explanatory notes are followed by "Hints to the Village Preacher." These hints are very suggestive, and will be found very useful homiletical aids. Last we have a list of new works that have been written on the psalm under consideration. Each psalm is treated in this way. Mr. Spurgeon considers this the great literary work of his life. "The Book of Psalms," he says, "instructs us in the use of wings as well as words: it sets us both mounting and singing." The work will be found a very valuable acquisition to any minister's library. It is also admirably suited for use in every Christian family.